United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, AUGUST 1, 2014 No. 123

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
August 1, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable STEVE WOMACK to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Dear God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

On this day, in the midst of great and urgent debate, we ask again that You give all Members peace and patience, with wisdom and courage to do what is best for our Nation.

Perplexing and competing questions and answers challenge us all to remember that our Nation is a people descended from immigrants, most in history, and many in faith. May all Americans, and those Members who represent them here, rise to the challenge of these days and prove to be the best of ourselves.

As always, may all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(a) of House Resolution 694, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GARCIA) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GARCIA led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 1, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on August 1, 2014 at 9:08 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to the conference report H.R. 3230.

That the Senate agreed without amendment H. Con. Res. 111.

That the Senate recedes in its amendment to the bill H.R. 5021.

Appointments:

State and Local Law Enforcement Congressional Badge of Bravery Board. Public Safety Officer Medal of Valor Review Board. State and Local Law Enforcement Congressional Badge of Bravery Board.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 700 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 700

Resolved, That the requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of September 5, 2014, providing for consideration or disposition of measures relating to the ongoing humanitarian crisis on the U.S. southern border, border security, and related immigration law.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order at any time through the legislative day of September 5, 2014, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV, relating to measures addressing the ongoing humanitarian crisis on the U.S. southern border, border security, and related immigration law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Rules Committee met to report a rule that would provide for same-day authority for any resolution reported from the Committee on Rules related to the ongoing humanitarian crisis on the southern border, border security, and related immigration law through September 5, 2014. Additionally, the

Printed on recycled paper.

rule provides suspension authority through September 5, 2014, on the same topics.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is very straightforward. It allows the House the maximum flexibility to deal with the crisis on the southern border during the district work period by providing both same-day and suspension authority through September 5.

Any legislation considered during this time period would still need to go through the regular process, by either a rule for consideration by the Rules Committee or under the standard suspension process. This resolution just allows for expedited consideration of those matters while preserving as much of the district work period as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this martial law rule.

The martial law authority created under this rule would last through September 5. In other words, the House Republicans can call us back on a whim, just to consider any kind of bill they call a border or immigration bill. So much for their 3-day rule. I wonder how much notice they have to give Speaker CRUZ before they call us back?

Let's just take a moment to remember how we got here.

The Republican leadership put together a partisan, inadequate, and unacceptable emergency supplemental bill that allegedly dealt with the humanitarian crisis at the southern border. That bill was mean-spirited and cruel, but it wasn't mean-spirited and cruel enough to satisfy the far-right wing of the Republican Conference. So the leadership tried to add another mean-spirited, cruel bill to block any further help for young immigrants under the DACA program, a program that has helped thousands of young people who have grown up in America come out of the shadows so they can go to school or hold a job without fear of being deported. But that wasn't mean-spirited and cruel enough for their base, so they pulled the whole package from the floor yesterday.

So last night, we had yet another meeting in the Rules Committee, and that is when they came up with this rule, but not a solution. That is right, Mr. Speaker. They still don't know what they are going to do. But I have an idea. They are going to make their cruel, mean-spirited immigration bill even worse, and that may not be enough to placate the far right who simply don't like immigrants.

Mr. Speaker, let's be honest. The far-right wing of the Republican base will never, ever be satisfied. And the martial-law authority created under this rule would last through September 5, so if the Republicans can somehow come up with even more mean-spirited bills, if they can figure out a way to act even more cruelly, they can bring us back again and again and again to vote.

Now, in case any Americans are still watching, they could be forgiven for being a little confused about what happened this week. On Wednesday, House Republicans voted to waste millions of taxpayer dollars to sue the President for what they claim is excessive executive action. But on Thursday, this is what Speaker BOEHNER said about the border crisis:

> There are numerous steps the President can and should be taking right now, without the need for congressional action, to secure our borders.

So which is it, Mr. Speaker? Is President Obama doing too much or not enough? I have got whiplash. It would be easier to take the Republicans seriously if they would just settle on one set of partisan talking points.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me say a few words about the crisis at our border.

There are nearly 50 million refugees around the world, 50 million people fleeing violence, brutality, oppression, famine, disease—50 million. But when 50,000 minors, one-tenth of 1 percent of the total number, arrive at our border, my Republican friends have a collective hissy fit.

Is this really the face of America that we want the rest of the world to see? The United States of America, a nation of immigrants, do we really want the rest of the world to see us like this, petty and mean and small? I hope not.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, obviously, my friend and I are going to have a disagreement about the nature of the bill that I think will, in rather short order, be before us. Let's go back and look at a little bit of history here.

The administration was warned in 2012 and 2013 that we were going to have a crisis on our hands if we didn't do something, that we were going to get a flow of unaccompanied minors. They did absolutely nothing. As a matter of fact, the President of the United States submitted a budget to us which cut money for enforcement and detention at the border, which cut money for support of people that were here while they were being processed, and that cut money for aid to the countries where most of these folks are coming from. That is real foresight.

So we have been confronted with a crisis, and a crisis that, in our view, the President contributed to by unilaterally changing whole sections of the immigration law and leaving the impression, probably unwittingly, I would say, but leaving the impression to many people that, if we get to the United States, we are going to be able to stay.

There is no question criminal elements have picked that impression up, broadcast it. Thousands of people have sent them tens of thousands—millions, really—of dollars and put children on a perilous journey of over 1,000 miles to this country.

Now we are trying to act on that, and we think, number one, if we don't do that, the societies from which they are coming are going to be disrupted. And we have been told very clearly by the leaders of those countries: We would like our children back.

Number two, if we don't stop this process, we are going to continue to enrich cartels to an extraordinary degree. Frankly, as one border agent told me, he said, from a cartel standpoint, this is actually easier than drugs, because with drugs we try to interdict you every step along the way, and if you get to the border to cross, we continue to try and interdict you. In this case, we actually, once they bring an illegal unaccompanied minor here, complete the transaction. So it is encouraging the flow, and that is dangerous for the young people involved.

We all know that in the course of that journey there is a risk that sex trafficking will take place. There is a risk that people will be lured or forced into drug dealing. There is a terrific physical risk. We know a lot of those folks are abused in the course of this process or sexually assaulted, so we need to stop this flow. We need to do it in a humane and appropriate way.

The President, by the way, has suggested that this is due to the 2008 law which we all passed, in good faith, to deal with sex trafficking. I personally don't think that is the case, but if that is true, then we ought to make some tweak to that law. We don't need to repeal it, but we need to make sure that we do something so that we don't have an enormous backlog here and we can actually handle the flow appropriately.

We have waited in vain for the President to tell us what that tweak is. I mean, it was his Secretary of Homeland Security that actually raised this issue and said we need to be able—he said this in testimony in front of the United States Senate—we need to be able to treat people coming from the three Central American countries essentially the same way we treat Canadian and Mexican minors that arrive at our border. That was the position, but we have not seen any more requests.

So if you look at our bill, frankly, number one, it is going to take care of that problem with a tweak. Number 2, we are going to provide additional moneys to handle this process through the end of the fiscal year and the end of the calendar year. Number 3, then we can work, because there will probably be additional resources needed next year, under the caps in the Ryan-Murray budget agreement and redirect that flow of money from less urgent to more urgent problems.

So we think it is a responsible way to proceed. I think, essentially, that is

what we are going to try and put before the House. Regardless, once we pass something, then the Senate can pass something.

I am sad to say, Mr. Speaker, that the other body was unable to do anything yesterday and it has adjourned and gone home. Frankly, we were unable to get things done yesterday in a way that I think I certainly would have liked, but we stayed here, and we are going to continue to work through the problem, present a product. Hopefully, the Senate will come back and do the same, and then we can proceed legislatively and provide the resources and legislative corrections that are needed to deal with the situation.

I am pleased that we are in session. I am pleased that we are working toward a solution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1015

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in today's paper, there is an op-ed. It is written by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the new majority leader. And in that op-ed he said: ''I have always believed that you must win the argument before you can win the vote. In Congress, committees act as idea factories for policies from both sides, and as majority leader, I will commit to the committee process and regular order.''

Apparently, he didn't start yesterday doing that. And we don't start today doing that. This legislation has not been considered by committee, subcommittee, and none of us have seen it at this point in time.

I heard the gentleman from Oklahoma say that the legislation is going to do this, that, and the other.

We haven't seen it. It is 10:15. We haven't seen it. No regular order. No exercising of responsibility. We saw irresponsibility rampant yesterday in the House of Representatives. We saw a few months ago, shutting down government if you don't do it my way.

I will tell the American people, Mr. Speaker, none of the leaders of the Republican Party have reached across to say, how can we do this in a bipartisan way. And so, because of their unwillingness to do that, Mr. Speaker, the Senate is gone. What we do today will be useless, a show, a form without substance, a pretense, a political message to their base of how hard they can be because they are moving in exactly the opposite direction of trying to create bipartisanship.

So I urge my colleagues, stand up for doing the right thing and giving the resources necessary to meet the challenge that America has and America ought to be meeting today and yesterday and the day before.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to disagree with my good friend, the minority whip, on a point.

I don't think the Senate left yesterday because of anything the House did. It failed to act, and it left. It went home because it couldn't pass a bill. That is something we are not going to allow to happen here. We are going to pass legislation. We are going to get our part of the job done.

The Senate, then, will be free to come back and pass something, and we can go into a conference and do exactly what my friend suggests, work out a compromise. So hopefully that is where we will end up in this process.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, there are two real crises before us, and the Republican response was the misbegotten legislation, withdrawn yesterday, as it should have been, but the other wasn't even on the table in any form.

There were 236 new fires started in the Western United States last night. There are 31 large fires that are uncontained. And the Forest Service and the BLM are running out of money. In the Senate bill—which, granted, it didn't pass—but in the President's proposal was emergency firefighting money. But somehow, the Republicans here don't think those fires are an emergency and they don't care about the loss of resources, the potential loss of life, and the loss of property that is going to result.

When those agencies run out of money, they can't stop fighting the fires, but they have will have to cut back on programs of preparedness and things that would mitigate the disaster of future fires, deal with forest health, fuel reduction, and all those things. But they couldn't care less. They are taking no action. They didn't even put forward a lame proposal on that, unlike their very lame proposal on the border.

Mr. COLE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman may be surprised to find that, actually, we are not too far apart on the issue.

Now, currently, we have over $700 million still on hand to deal with wildfires. The gentleman and I actually cosponsored legislation that our friend from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) has offered so that we can actually deal with this and change the structure of how we fund wildfire fighting. I suspect that issue will come back again. As a matter of fact, I was willing to work during the budget process with some of my friends on the other side of the Rules Committee to actually write the change into the budget. We had the votes on our side, working with our friends, to do that. For some reason, the Democratic amendment was withdrawn. I don't know why, and I cast no aspersions. But that is an area where we would like to work with you. I don't think it is particularly appropriate to be done in this bill.

This bill is about dealing with the crisis on the southern border. It shouldn't be a Christmas tree or a grab bag. If we need additional resources, we should come back to do that. Again, we have sufficient resources on hand. Congress will be back in session in September, back in session after the elections. So I think we are going to have multiple opportunities to deal with this.

I look forward to working with my friends on this particular issue when those opportunities occur.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we would like to work on that. As I said, no option has been given to us for that. Secondly, you are not following regular order on the legislation. What is needed now are resources. And the reason the Senate didn't act is because no Member of your party would support action.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GARCIA).

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I am a fortunate man. I am a fortunate man because half a century ago, my father, at 17 years old, arrived at this country with my mother. And this country gave them refuge. Later, the rest of our family came. This country has been tremendously generous, as we were brutalized by a leftwing dictatorship, the Castro dictatorship.

And to think, Mr. Speaker, that a fellow Cuban American sits in the other House, dictating to this House that we should strip away rights, strip away rights from children, is unacceptable. It is un-American.

I am a fortunate man. And we are a rich and plentiful country, a country of laws.

We have an opportunity to do the right thing, to pass the bipartisan, comprehensive bill that the other House passed. It has now been 1 year and 1 month since that happened. The time has come. Let us pass comprehensive immigration reform.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to disagree with my friend on the root of this issue. I don't think whether or not we passed immigration reform has anything to do with the border crisis. I really don't. Frankly, what is occurring there would be illegal had we passed what the Senate passed. So it just simply doesn't address the problem.

What the problem here is, by our own actions in this country, we have sent a message that if you get here, you can stay, whether you are legally entitled to or not. And it is going to take so long to process you, you will essentially never be sent back.

And we have allowed criminal cartels to distort our position and to make tens of millions of dollars off of this. That needs to be stopped. That needs to be reversed. It is not helpful to anybody.

Now, again, we may differ on the ideas. Although, I would point out for the record once more, the administration did ask: Please do something about the 2008 law. They asked that a month ago. And then they have sort of gotten quiet since then. We don't hear anything else about that.

They have asked for resources. We have looked at what they need. We said we will be willing to do that. We are going to take them from existing moneys. We are not going to spend new money. This is an urgent priority. We think you are right. We are going to redirect that. And by the way, if you are going to need additional resources next year, we will work with you again there. We are going to do it under the Ryan-Murray budget cap. We are not going to go outside the process. And we are using that.

I think my friend from Maryland, the minority whip, is correct. We are using exceptional procedures—but they are procedures within the traditions of this House—to react to a crisis situation, and we are trying to stay here to get our work done and hopefully challenge the Senate to come back and do the same thing. So we are working the process and the crisis as best we can. With that, we will continue to work.

And I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, I spoke on the connection between comprehensive immigration reform and the crisis that we have at our border. And I said then—and I will say it again—that it is the height of hypocrisy to be talking about trying to do something about our border security when we can't even bring comprehensive immigration reform to this floor that would have provided the funding for increased border security. You can't have it both ways.

But the Republican leadership said earlier this week and yesterday that, in fact, maybe the President should use his executive authority to deal with the issue at the border. But on Tuesday, they provided funding—some $2 million—to sue the President for excessive use of executive authority. Which is it? You can't have it both ways. But it seems like some of our colleagues want to do that.

And then finally, a colleague from the Valley just said this morning: The problem we have is that some of our people just don't want to govern. That is correct. They don't. Once again, we are seeing politics trump good public policy for the people of our country.

What we ought to be doing is returning back to regular order. What we ought to be doing is putting together a bipartisan effort to solve our border problems and to bring about comprehensive immigration reform for all the people of this country. That is what we ought to be doing.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS).

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I am here as a Member of this body who was sent here to work—quite frankly, which is the main reason why most immigrants come to this country—to work, to contribute to our economy, and to do the jobs that most of us are unwilling to do.

But the point that I want to make at this moment is that what the Republican proposal tried to do yesterday—and it failed—and what they are trying to do today is to strip away the rights of a child to live. The Republicans want to indiscriminately return children to their death.

And I challenge any American to look into yourself and realize and find out that many of these children will be returned with or without a change of the law today. They will be returned. But the ones that deserve to live should be able to stay. And the law was passed unanimously in 2008 to give that opportunity to those children, to these children, the children that are breathing today, the children who came to the most giving, loving, caring land ever created on Earth. And that is now about to change if they are successful.

Mr. COLE. I yield myself such time as I may consume, Mr. Speaker.

I think we need to step back from the emotion a moment and look at the realities of the situation. Number one, anybody that seeks refugee status in the United States can go to any of the embassies in the country and request it. You don't have to travel 1,000 miles. You can go request it, and we will look to see whether or not you qualify.

Number two, the President of the United States has said that the vast majority of these children will be returned. That is not us. That is the President. He has said that. We are trying to do it and work with him in an expeditious way because we think sooner is better.

Number three, we are not returning them to criminals. We are returning them to the custody of their governments, their own officials, who are probably better situated to make these decisions than we are 1,000-plus miles away.

So let's be real. Nobody is stripping any rights away from anyone. We actually have a situation—a 2008 law—where a loophole has been exploited by criminals. That is what is happening. And we are trying to stop the loophole and keep people from embarking on a dangerous journey and discourage people from giving thousands of dollars of their hard-earned money to criminal cartels to participate in that. That is the effort that is underway here.

Nobody would have fewer rights than the people that are currently here from Mexico or Canada. We would still have the ability to adjudicate issues. The process would be a lot faster and, we think in that sense, more humane and more efficient and more expeditious.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1030

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I and my colleagues on this side of the aisle don't have the intuitive gift to know that every child or the majority of every child that is there doesn't have a right to refuge and doesn't have a right to asylum.

That is why we have been so tenacious about protecting a law that provides due process, adjudication, and representation for these children, so that they have a fair opportunity to get refuge and to get asylum as the law prescribes.

The previous bill that failed dismantled that. TED CRUZ did not give it his seal of the approval, so it didn't get out of the Republican Caucus. Now, before us, we have a rule that is fraudulent, we have a forthcoming law that will be fraudulent, and it will be worse than the previous one.

Now, we are going to codify getting rid of DREAMers and DACA into this law. What is the purpose? To turn out a base? Is this a political strategy? Is this a political expediency on the shoulders of children, on the shoulders of the American values, and on the shoulders of our history?

How shameful, how cynical—vote ''no'' on the rule.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, again, I just want to make the point to my friend. Nobody is trying to strip away the rights from anyone. The 2008 law has been abused. Those people have found a loophole in it, and they have clogged the legal system. We have offered not a repeal, but a relatively minor fix.

The President of the United States and his administration have also said this law is at fault. As a matter of fact, they are actually the ones who put that suggestion out there. The President of the United States is the person who said the vast majority of these people need to go home and will eventually go home. So if he has a better way to do this, we would love to see the proposal.

What he sent us was a funding proposal with no fix at all. It is a proposal aimed at better managing the flow of people, but not reversing that. It is a proposal, frankly, that goes well beyond this fiscal year, well beyond this calendar year, and allows him basically to operate outside the budget agreement limits—the caps—that we have all agreed to. We don't think that is appropriate. We think you reprioritize money toward the more urgent issue.

We agree with the President. This is an urgent issue. We are willing to find the savings in other parts of the budget. We are not willing to break the budget, and we are not willing to break the budget caps that both sides agreed to. That is really, I think, the essence of the difference. We are trying to offer a solution. It may not be the final solution.

I hope the Senate will offer their solution. We can go to conference, and we can work with the President, but so far, the only ideas that have been put forward to actually fix the problem, I think, have largely come from our side of the aisle.

I am sure that won't last indefinitely. I think my friends will do the same thing, but certainly, they dominate the Senate. The Senate can do the same thing. Sooner or later, they will get it done.

We will continue to work on this, but for right now, again, nobody's aim is to strip anybody's rights away, but we are going to try to confront an urgent crisis, and we are going to try and do it in an expeditious way, in a responsible way, and in a limited way.

We can come back here and look at the larger issues in September and after the election. With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. MCGOVERN. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am a little confused. The gentleman said that they have offered a solution. Is H.R. 15 contained in this rule or is any legislation to deal with our border contained in this rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not interpret the resolution. That is a matter for debate.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Can the Chair at least inform us whether or not there is anything of substance in this rule other than a martial law rule that allows them to call us back at any point from now until September 5?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As stated, the Chair will not interpret the pending resolution.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, a sign: ''Not our kids, not our problems,'' held angrily by a mob, shaken with ''go home,'' to a group of little children who have made a perilous journey to this country. That really epitomizes what the Republican approach to this problem is.

They care about these children so much that their proposal is to tell them to get out of here just as quick as they can, before they can present their claims that they were trafficked, or that they suffer a return to violence, murder, and rape at home.

The second thing they do, instead of unclogging our broken immigration system, is to say we need more semiautomatic weapons and military uniforms on our borders to greet these little children.

Finally, they say to another group of students, those who have told us ''I have a dream,'' our DREAMers, that they want to turn that dream into a nightmare and send them away also.

I think that is the wrong approach. It is time for them to get off Cruz Control and join us for comprehensive immigration reform.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I couldn't disagree with my good friend from Texas more. I think everybody on both sides of the aisle cares about these children. Now, we care about them enough to restore the cuts that the President made in the aids to the country of origin.

We care about them enough to restore the cuts that he made in his budget to our own border security. Yes, our border security does need to be armed, not to deal with children, but to deal with the criminals that brought them here and abused them in the process. That is what we are talking about here.

Now, there is nothing to be gained by continuing this flow. Even if some of you would like every particular person that got here to stay—and, again, I quote the President, the ''vast majority'' will not be allowed to, will be sent back—stopping the flow is what we ought to be focusing on and stopping people from giving thousands of dollars to criminal cartels to bring these children to the borders and abuse them in the process. The quicker that stops, the better off we are.

We are willing to work with the countries of origin, I think, on both sides of the aisle. We had the President up here saying, pretty emphatically, that they needed some assistance in dealing with that. We think that is appropriate. We try to do that in legislation, and frankly, we have done it in the foreign operations bill, where we are more generous to the countries of origin than the administration has suggested we should be in its own budget.

Mr. Speaker, we are interested in dealing with the problem, but we are also interested in helping countries keep their children in their country, which they tell us they want to do.

We are also interested in making sure those children are never subjected to this journey, which I think all would agree is difficult and dangerous, and we are also extraordinarily interested in making sure that the criminal cartels who are making profit off this are discouraged from doing this, that they can't go and tell their potential customers: Give us the money and put your kid at risk, but if we actually get them there, there is a good chance they will stay.

That false promise, that dangerous promise offered by criminals victimizing innocent people is frankly what we ought to be focused on and what we are trying to focus on.

Again, we will continue to work toward that end. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we have a good product. I think that we will. The House will consider it, and then we hope the Senate actually comes back from its district work period and deals with it as well, and we will go from there.

That is the reason for the rule. That is the reason, so we can act during this multiweek district work period, should the opportunity actually occur to do that.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA), the chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, I rise again in opposition to this rule and against the martial law bill which has not been given to us to read, and I believe that that is the wrong thing to do to solve this problem.

Instead of working with Democrats to come up with a viable and bipartisan solution to deal with the vulnerable Central American children who are fleeing from violence and death, my Republican colleagues are apparently drafting a bill that is even worse than the one they proposed yesterday, on Thursday.

This new bill presumably continues the failed policy of enforcement only and will send thousands of these children back to certain death. If the funding levels remain the same as yesterday, the bill will not provide adequate funding to care for them while they are here.

We should instead be spending our time debating and voting on the bipartisan Senate comprehensive immigration bill that the Speaker has refused to bring up for over a year.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule and the martial law.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the ranking member of the Rules Committee, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield for that request?

Mr. COLE. No, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not yield. Therefore, the request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me make clear to the House that if we defeat the previous question, I will offer

an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 15, our immigration reform bill.

At this point, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, which we have been promised consideration on for so long, to address this crisis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma would need to yield for the purpose of that request.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I would ask him to yield to the unanimous consent request so we can deal with this immigration problem in a comprehensive manner.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I will not yield, and I do want to reiterate my previous announcement that all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only. I am not yielding for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma does not yield.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent and would ask my friend to allow the bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill, H.R. 15, to be considered. It is a bill that I proudly cosponsor, and it would more than adequately address this humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform bill, to the floor. It was passed by the Senate over 1 year ago.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Once again, the Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Once again, the Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Once again, the Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Once again, the Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15 today, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform measure to deal with the immigration problems we have and to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border that is taking place today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Again, the Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I, as chair emeritus of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

As the Chair advised on January 15, 2014, and March 26, 2014, even though a unanimous consent request to consider a measure is not entertained, embellishments accompanying such requests constitute debate and may become an imposition on the time of the Member who yielded for that purpose.

□ 1045

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. O'ROURKE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address these humanitarian issues.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to bring real solutions to the problems at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GARCIA) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms.

KAPTUR) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at our border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at our border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crises at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, which is a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill first brought to us by President Bush, a bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose. The gentleman from Massachusetts will be charged for the time accordingly.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15 to the floor, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at our border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border to the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to simply allow a vote on H.R. 15, a bill that has the bipartisan votes to pass today that we can have on the President's desk today to properly address this crisis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Once again, the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose. Time will be deducted from the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 16¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment that I will offer in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. O'ROURKE).

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, looking at the underlying bill, I have to wonder what my colleagues are afraid of. Are they afraid of these kids, children who are fleeing brutal violence in their home countries to come to our country to seek asylum? Are we so afraid of them that we would shortcut due process and send them right back into this violence?

Mr. Speaker, are they afraid of the border, that they would send the National Guard when we are already spending $18 billion a year; more than on all Federal law enforcement combined; at a time when El Paso, Texas, the largest Texas city on the Mexican border, is also the safest city in this country; at a time when we are 70 percent lower in apprehensions at our southern border; and at a time when these apprehensions of children have fallen by almost 60 percent?

Mr. Speaker, I ask us not to be motivated by fear or anxiety, but instead the best traditions of this country: courage, compassion, and strength to do the right thing.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the ranking

member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, we keep hearing that the antislavery law has some loophole that is being exploited. That is not the truth. It is not what the Evangelical Immigration Table says. Here is what they write:

By making the legal process clearer and more efficient for children, the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops found that the law is working. It should not be changed to address the current temporary situation. The law allows for responses to exceptional circumstances.

That is not some open borders crowd. That is the National Association of Evangelicals. That is the Southern Baptists. That is the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities.

I would note, also, that over a year ago we saw the Senate come together to pass bipartisan immigration reform. Republicans in this House have blocked a vote. We should vote on it today and get it to the President.

EVANGELICAL IMMIGRATION TABLE,
July 22, 2014.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS, In a matter of months, more than 50,000 unaccompanied children have arrived in the United States. Millions of Americans have been moved by the plight of these children who are currently awaiting processing, with many asking how they can help.

Children are vulnerable even in the best of circumstances and warrant special protection beyond that offered to adults. This vulnerability is compounded among children who flee situations of criminal gangs, sexual violence, trauma and extreme poverty, without their parents to accompany them.

Evangelicals are guided by Jesus' admonitions to welcome and protect children (Matthew 18:6, Mark 9:37, Luke 18:15–17). As our nation responds to this humanitarian crisis, we are thankful for laws that protect children and provide for their needs. While our systems are currently stretched, our laws uphold basic child protection principles.

Accordingly, we are concerned about potential weakening of protections afforded by the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act (TVPRA) which was enacted in 2008 and reauthorized in 2013. The TVPRA ensures that victims of trafficking are not only identified and screened properly but that traffickers are penalized and brought to justice. It also appropriately assigns responsibility for the care of unaccompanied children to the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) and ensures that children are placed with their families when possible. By making the legal process clearer and more efficient for children, the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops found that since the passage and implementation of TVPRA 23% more children were assisted. The TVPRA is working according to its design. It should not be changed to address the current temporary situation. The law allows for responses to exceptional circumstances.

Additionally, we urge you to provide the necessary resources and policy guidance to address the current crisis, and then hold the Administration accountable for fulfilling its responsibilities under the law. Robust funding is needed for the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) in HHS which has extensive experience with vulnerable immigrants, including UACs, refugees, and victims of trafficking. To respond to this crisis, ORR is considering reprogramming funding from other refugee programs. Funds must not simply be transferred from one vulnerable population to another. More funding is needed. There should also be increased funding for immigration courts and judges to more quickly screen the children and counsel for children going through legal proceedings so they know their rights and can understand the process. More robust investment in effectively addressing root causes of migration in Central America and Mexico is also imperative.

As we pray for these children and also our nation, we are reminded of Matthew 19:13–14 in which Jesus said, ''Let the little children come to me, and do not hinder them.' Churches and faith-based organizations have long partnered with the federal government in serving immigrant children and families in the United States. Many churches and faith-based organizations are ready and committed to provide the same type of assistance and pastoral care in the case of these unaccompanied children.

We offer our prayers and service as you make important decisions about our nation's response to migrant children. We hope that any response you make will strengthen our country's tradition of providing safety and refuge to the vulnerable.

Sincerely,

Leith Anderson, President, National Association of Evangelicals; Stephan Bauman, President and CEO, World Relief; David Beckmann, President, Bread for the World; Noel Castellanos, CEO, Christian Community Development Association; Russell D. Moore, President, Southern Baptist Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission; William Robinson, Interim President, Council for Christian Colleges and Universities; Samuel Rodriguez, President, National Hispanic Christian Leadership Conference; Gabriel Salguero, President, National Latino Evangelical Coalition; Richard Stearns, President, World Vision U.S.; Jim Wallis, President and Founder, Sojourners.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to point out that if the 2008 law is not the reason, then my good friend's remarks need to be directed to the administration because they have told us it is the reason. The President has cited this as the reason. But if it is because we have sent a signal down there by unilaterally changing something, there is some explanation for a tenfold increase in the flow of individuals across our border.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, 102 years ago, I assume a very frightened 14-year-old boy made his way on a boat called the RMS Caronia from Cork, Ireland, with his mother on his way to the United States, a very frightened 14-year-old boy who left behind his community, his friends and neighbors, and made his way to the United States. He later served in World War I and became a New York City police officer but didn't live long enough to see his grandson become a Member of the House of Representatives. But that 14-year-old boy contributed mightily to the United States of America in so many ways. He was a scared boy being brought to America in much the same way that children along our border today are coming to seek a better way.

Don't turn our backs on these young children, these boys and girls, many of whom are suffering. Show the compassion and beauty of the United States. Welcome the best, the brightest, and the bravest.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO).

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the arrival of tens of thousands of children from Central America seeking refuge in our country has tugged at the conscience of the American people. It has demonstrated both our best and our worst instincts. The best are all of the people who are so generous in offering food and clothing and shelter to these kids who have come from so far. But we have also seen some bad instincts, like the armed militiamen in ski masks who have shown up at our southern border, whose leader has said that the way you keep people from coming to this country is that you point a gun at them and threaten to shoot them in the head. That is not America.

The question that we must answer now is: What does it mean to be a refugee in the 21st century? Just as we offered that status to Cubans fleeing Castro, to those from the Soviet Union, to the Vietnamese, just as our adversaries have changed, they are not always state actors—they are al Qaeda; they are ISIS—I would argue that so, too, have our refugees changed, and we must recognize that.

This bill is not good for our country, and it doesn't reflect who we are as a people.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), the ranking member of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I wonder what my grandmother coming from Jamaica, West Indies, with two babies thought about this great country called America. I wondered as I went to the border and I looked into the eyes of a little 7-year-old who had just gotten off a bus by himself from someplace in Central America, or the toddler in a diaper who came here because there was true and actual violence, the beheading of their neighbors, the cutting of the throats of their young boys, the fear of the cartels, and to think of the words ''no room at the inn.''

□ 1100

Our Republicans are confused. They are prosecuting the children, not prosecuting the drug dealers, the criminals, and others. Why? Because they are taking away basic due process rights for humble children who have come just for opportunity. Not only that, they don't even want to give resources to all the cities in America who are helping, the Good Samaritans. And then they want legislation that literally undermines due process for these children.

I will tell you this is a bad bill. Do not pass it. Pass comprehensive immigration reform. Pass it now.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in fervid opposition to this Martial Law Resolution and ask that you consider doing comprehensive immigration reform—a vote you would not even need to whip.

Yet we insist on wasting valuable House Floor time while we could be doing comprehensive immigration reform, comprehensive tax reform, the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization, or the Voting Rights Act.

As the GOP Majority reaches further to the anti-immigrant right to scrounge up the votes for what was already an inadequate and heartless proposal, we Democrats have a better idea: comprehensive immigration reform.

The bipartisan immigration legislation that passed the Senate over a year ago offers comprehensive answers to the problems with our immigration system—but for more than a year House Republicans have refused to give the American people a vote.

The humanitarian crisis at the border is a powerful reminder of the importance of an immigration system that honors our values as a nation. The time is now. While House Republicans search for the compassion to help desperate children, Democrats are demanding a vote on the comprehensive immigration reform our nation needs.

The United States is a country made up of immigrants, and it is part of what makes us so strong and vibrant. And while immigration reform remains an unsolved challenge for our nation, House Democrats are leading the way towards comprehensive reform.

Indeed, the decision made by President Obama two years ago to defer deportation action against young people who were brought here by undocumented parents but have been raised here in our country was an important step in the right direction.

This decision has helped ensure that over half-a-million hard-working, eager, and talented individuals who came here not of their own choice, and who are contributing to our economy and our defense, can remain here and continue to be part of building a strong future for America.

Now we are faced, Mr. Speaker, with the surge of unaccompanied children on our southern border. They do not pose a threat to our national security; nevertheless the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act must be passed before Congress leaves town for its district work-recess.

Contrary to the shrill rhetoric used by some commentators, the nation is not being invaded by an army of children dispatched to do us harm. In fact the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee and I witnessed one month ago the deplorable conditions with your own eyes—babies as young as three years old.

We are confronted with a humanitarian crisis resulting from the alarming scale of violence and economic desperation in three Central American countries: El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala. Politicizing the issue will not solve the problem.

In the short term, we need to allocate the resources needed to deal with the increase in unaccompanied children seeking refuge in the United States.

Yet this Congress has failed to provide any resources needed to fund the courts and judges needed to send these children through the legal system; therefore, we should fund the number of immigration judges needed. Without them, the result is a current average delay of 578 days to hear over 366,000 pending cases.

Because this situation is untenable for everyone—law enforcement, taxpayers, and individuals petitioning for relief, the first thing that we can and should do to reduce the backlog is pass the emergency supplemental and provide the funding needed to appoint 70 new immigration judges, as provided under legislation I recently introduced, H.R. 4990, the Justice For All Children Act.

I remain committed to working with my colleagues, on a bipartisan basis, on this very important issue, and would hope for a spill-over effect into the realm of comprehensive immigration reform.

I remain committed to advocating for common sense enforcement measures as part of a broader immigration reform package that will further secure our borders, ensure agricultural interests have an ample labor supply, universities and businesses are not short workers, and proper workplace compliance is achieved, but also uphold our values as a Nation of immigrants.

Mr. Speaker, No Room at the inn! The Republicans are confused. Let us as Americans give relief to these innocent children. I ask my colleagues to reject this resolution and call for a vote on comprehensive immigration reform and the full funding of the emergency supplemental by hiring 70 new immigration judges, provide more resources for the border, to protect vulnerable children, and help communities that are helping these children.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

(Mr. SERRANO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, at the end of the day, the question may not be: Who are the children at the border, and why they are here? The question may be: Who are we as a Nation, and why are we here as a Congress?

Our reputation has been never to turn people away, our reputation should never be to turn children away to what could be a certain death or a very difficult situation.

This is not a crisis. This is a situation that we have had before and we have known how to deal with. This is a moment for our country to show who we are. The world is looking. These are children. It is not their fault that they are here. There are many conditions that have brought them here. But how we act will be our fault if we don't act properly. How we act will be our legacy.

This is not who we are as a country—I repeat. We are much better than that. We have to understand that these are children, these are our children. Just because a border separates us, this doesn't stop them from being our children.

Let's turn down and reject all of this nonsense that we are doing, and let's try to help them and help them in the proper way.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Dr. King reminds us that the truest measure of the person is not where you stand in times of comfort and convenience, but where do you stand in times of challenge and controversy.

In these times of challenge and controversy, I stand with those children at the border and I stand for due process. I don't stand for a fast-track adjudication that mimics due process and makes a mockery of justice.

I stand with the DREAMers. They have been given hope by our President. I will not vote for a bill that will destroy hope for those DREAMers. We must keep their hope alive.

I stand for due process, I stand with the DREAMers, and I stand for hope. I stand with the President.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman from Oklahoma how many speakers he has?

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close whenever my friend is.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask for a unanimous consent request, because the interest on this issue and the passion on this issue on our side is so great that we don't have enough time.

So I would ask unanimous consent to extend the debate by 1 hour, equally divided. Like I said, we have a lot of speakers, and there is no pending business after this debate ends. At the very least, I think we can extend the debate.

We were not allowed any amendments when the previous incarnation of this border bill was brought before the House. I think the least we can do, in the spirit of collegiality, is to expand debate, and I would like to make that unanimous consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield for that request?

Mr. COLE. I do not, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not yield for that purpose.

The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I will try again.

At this time, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day for the United States when Republicans in this Congress see a problem and then choose not to work with Democrats to solve the problem. That is exactly what has happened here today: their draconian way or the highway.

Let's be clear about what the problem is: unaccompanied minor children, frightened, some fleeing violence, needing due process, and deserving due process.

This is as much about who these children are as it is about who we are. As a mother and a legislator, I know that we should be compelled to act as a matter of humanity, but also as a matter of law.

We know we have problems on the border that are in need of solutions. Republicans have rejected one solution—comprehensive immigration reform—to address the problem. They have rejected another solution—the request of the President for a supplemental appropriation that includes resources for judges, representation, and services for minor children, and assistance to the countries of origin.

Now today, in the eleventh hour, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle demonstrate once again their lack of humanity and failure to solve yet another problem for the American people.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD).

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill.

Sadly, the Republican leadership is continuing to play politics with the lives of innocent children at our border by failing to bring forward a bipartisan supplemental spending bill that can pass the House and be signed into law.

It is unbelievable that the failure to pass their own bill yesterday was not because of its completely inadequate funding level or the fact that it would undercut critical humanitarian protections in current law, but because it was not mean enough or punitive enough for their own Members to vote on.

Working together, as Leader PELOSI offered Speaker BOEHNER but was refused, we could have come to a reasonable compromise.

Instead, Republicans have resorted to martial law, not because it is in the best interest of our country or these children, but so they can have the time to write a bill that will appease the extremists in their party.

Let's reject this rule and come together in the best tradition of this House to pass a clean supplemental bill that will address the humanitarian crisis at our border in a way that meets our government's urgent needs and upholds our most basic American values.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in strong opposition to this bill.

I have been deeply saddened and distressed to see the images and hear the stories of so many unaccompanied minors at our border.

But from Massachusetts, I have also read other stories. I have read the stories of the over 150 overdoses from heroin that we experienced in Taunton, with over ten deaths.

I recently met with the DEA officials in Massachusetts, who indicated that the heroin drug trade alone with Mexico is over $40 billion a year; that the cartels have moved up into owning trafficking corridors throughout Mexico; that despite many of my other colleagues who are calling for the destruction of aid and reduction of aid to Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador, the United States bilateral aid is less than $200 million a year. Gang violence in Los Angeles alone costs over $1 billion a year.

If we are truly going to address this problem, we have to get to its core. We have to take a good, hard look at what is driving an economic instability that is pushing young kids to figure that they have a better life by getting on a bus by themselves to our border.

This is what our country is supposed to be all about: a better future for young children trying to make a life for themselves. I hope that we come to that conclusion.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), my good friend, my colleague on the Rules Committee.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague on the Rules Committee, my friend from Oklahoma, for yielding.

I am not sure what it is that is happening here on this floor right now because the bill that is before us that everyone is rising to object to is the bill that allows us to bring up the same day, just as soon as we find a solution that can bring this House together, bring a bill immediately to the floor to solve a crisis. I just want to make that clear. The bill that is before us today is the only piece of legislation in this town that allows us to move immediately to solve a crisis. I am not talking about a crisis that is imagined by Republicans or imagined by Democrats.

I have in my hand here a letter from Jeh Johnson, the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security. Mr. Speaker. In an open letter to families all across the world he says:

> So, let me be clear: there is no path to deferred action or citizenship, or one being contemplated by Congress, for a child who crosses our border illegally today.

I have heard the hearts of my friends on the other side of the aisle, I have heard the hearts. But we are a Nation of laws, as well as hearts, and you know that the law of the land does not allow for that, as the Secretary of Homeland Security said. Yet, down here on the floor today, if I was watching this from my home in Guatemala or Honduras or El Salvador, I would be led to believe there is.

We are better than that, and we have to be better than that because this is, in fact, a crisis. It is not an imagined crisis. It is a real crisis.

Folks thought this House was going to go home yesterday, they thought this House was going to go home yesterday, just like the Senate did, without providing a response. That is not the House I ran to be a part of.

We are still here, we are still here working, and, by golly, I believe we are going to have a solution on the floor. I believe we are going to have a solution on the floor before the Sun goes down today, and I am so proud, I am so proud that we are here to do that. But I tell you this, we cannot do it if this bill does not pass. This rule today gives us a pathway to success. In its absence, that pathway will be delayed.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman referred to a bill that the Republicans are working on. We haven't seen such a bill. Does this rule give us any indication of what bill they are talking about?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Once again, the Chair will not interpret the pending resolution.

The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN).

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I will answer my friend's question that was just asked as he was speaking.

What is happening on the floor is Republicans are trying to weaken human trafficking laws. That is what is happening.

Over the last few days, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have jumped through linguistic and logical hoops to say that the most humane way to deal with these children is to deport them quickly without due process to discourage other children from making the dangerous journey.

There is no question that the journey is dangerous. Children are killed, robbed, raped, and maimed along the way, but the children know the risks. They are not ignorant to those risks.

Why? Because back in Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala, children are being raped, killed, and robbed every day. It is a fact. Read the news.

Deporting children without process to these conditions or locking them into their home countries and preventing them from fleeing to find safety is not humane. It would be, as the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops said, like sending them back into a burning building. We can do better than this.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, this rule, exactly what bill is it that we are going to vote for or against as relates to the rule? Because depending on the substance of the bill, it is going to determine whether I vote for or against the rule. If they are not prepared to tell us exactly what the bill is going to be in it, how could we possibly make a judgment as to whether we support the rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Once again, as the Chair has said repeatedly, the Chair will not interpret the pending resolution. That is a matter for debate among the Members.

Mr. RANGEL. May I further inquire, we are not asking you to opine anything, Mr. Speaker. We are asking you to tell us exactly what we will be debating. If we don't know what we are going to be debating—I am not asking the Speaker to tell us what is in the bill. I am asking the Speaker to find out from the majority exactly what this rule is going to be allowed for them to bring up so that I would know whether to stay here or not to stay here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. To the gentleman, the Chair would say that that matter is for debate among the Members.

Mr. RANGEL. Debate on what, Mr. Speaker? Just tell me what will we be debating on? That is my question. You tell me what the Members will be debating on, and I am satisfied. I don't want you to opine. I want you to tell me what is going to be in the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has been patient with the gentleman from New York. The gentleman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry.

The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, a man once said:

> I believe in the idea of amnesty for those who have put down roots and who have lived here, even though sometime back they may have entered illegally.

Mr. Speaker, those words were from the great bastion of Republican thinking: President Ronald Reagan.

□ 1115

Oh, how his party has changed. In fact, Mr. Speaker, if Ronald Reagan were in office today, he would probably have a primary challenge for being too ''liberal'' thinking.

Mr. Speaker, the House today is bringing up their only immigration-related bill, and it has just one message: deport, deport, deport. Deport children seeking refuge from extreme violence. Deport a mother away from her children. Deport a young person who has pledged allegiance only to one flag, and that is our flag.

Mr. Speaker, it looks like the bill the Republicans will want to bring is a security only, no to DREAMers supplemental. It does not address our broken immigration system. Have we lost the core message of our country? What happened to, ''Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free''? What happened to that America?

I am sure Ronald Reagan knows, but his party does not.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 5¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out against the legislation being put forward by the House Republicans, which is an insincere attempt to address the humanitarian crisis at our border.

This bill is misguided, unreasonable, and wrong. It does very little to address the actual root of this problem and cuts important funding from the Department of Defense, FEMA, and the State Department's Economic Support Fund.

I oppose this legislation and urge my colleagues to return to the drawing board, so we can help these children and fix this issue.

(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows:)

The proposed legislation is ill-conceived, and does not solve the main problem.

I am opposed to this legislation and ask my colleagues to propose a solution that really helps these children.

Thank you.

La legislación propuesta está mal planteada, y no resolverá el problema principal.

Estoy opuesto a esta legislación y pido que mis colegas propongan una solución que realmente ayudara a estos niños.

Gracias.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds the gentleman that he will need to provide the Clerk a translation for the RECORD.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, when the Republican leadership pulled this legislation from the floor, I assumed that they had come to their senses and realized that they couldn't treat children so poorly. Much to my shock, however, your old bill was not punitive enough for these children, so you went back and made it worse.

Mr. Speaker, when did we lose our way? Let me be crystal clear. The change that has been added to the supplemental will make the lives of the children worse.

How we respond to a crisis of children in need of safe haven speaks to the character of our Nation, to who we are. How could we go around the world and provide resources and bring democracy, yet treat our neighbors this way?

We should not gut children's protections, just to appease the most radical elements of a particular political party. That is not the American way.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, the course of the debate is about to end. There is representation that there is an underlying bill to this martial law. The Democrats have already made a commitment to stay and finish the job.

My inquiry is, the underlying bill's principles are based upon protecting children and fully funding the President's mark on the emergency supplemental to deal with this crisis and emergency.

Those are simple parliamentary inquiries as the underlying premise of the bill—two points: protecting the children and providing the full resources for helping the children. That is not giving us the contents of the bill. It is the premise of the bill for Members to be able to intelligently come to floor to assess the need to vote for the martial law.

I, again, state the parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry.

The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

Mr. RANGEL. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know how we can possibly frame a parliamentary inquiry to find out exactly what is in the underlying bill that we are asked to pass or vote against this rule.

In any event, I know one thing. We as Americans, especially those of us in the Congress, have a particular responsibility to pass on a legacy to those that follow us in terms of what this country really stands for.

Besides the Star-Spangled Banner and the Stars and Stripes, we also have the Statue of Liberty close to my hometown. People come from all over the world because it is symbolic of what this great country believes in.

Not that many years ago, a group of Jewish people attempted to flee Germany because they feared that Hitler

would be looking for them in order to arrest, kill, and to eliminate them as a people. We refused that ship that came into our harbor, called the St. Louis. We denied them the opportunity to come to this country, and they returned to Germany.

I don't know what is on our conscience, but we should take a look at our history and what we are leaving as a legacy.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I would just point out that the legal experts in the country have urged that we not change the antislavery law.

We do recognize the need for resources to make that law work. I can't help but notice that the Republican majority is denying the resources to actually adjudicate these cases in the bill that was before us yesterday. I think it is ironic to say it doesn't work and then say we won't give you the resources to allow you to enforce the law. It is hypocrisy at its worst.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire from the gentleman from Oklahoma whether he has any additional speakers or if he would like to give us some of his time?

Mr. COLE. I am prepared to close whenever my friend is prepared to close.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this terrible martial law rule. We have no idea what the hell we are going to be voting on.

This is just a rule that allows them to bring up anything at any time between now and September 5. I want to urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question, and if we defeat the previous question, I will bring up H.R. 15, which is the bipartisan Senate passed comprehensive immigration reform bill.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about poor kids, most of them fleeing terrible violence. I am ashamed at the insensitivity and the lack of compassion from the other side. America is a better country. Let's not lose our humanity in this process.

If the United States of America stands for anything, it stands out loud and foursquare for human rights. We are better than the angry mobs yelling at children. The anger and the nastiness and the insensitivity is not the face of America we want to show the rest of the world. We are better. I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to act like it.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

We have had a very passionate and—in many cases, compassionate—debate. I want to recognize that quality in many of the speakers, my friends on the other side. I have no doubt about their passion. Frankly, I have no doubt about their compassion. I know they want to do the right thing.

I also want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that this bill actually is, as my friend from Massachusetts suggested, a mechanism to keep us in session and working on the problem, so that we have the ability between now and September 5 to actually act and act quickly. I think that is a very important thing.

It is important, too, to think back about the nature of the problem that we are dealing with. In the last 3 years, the number of unaccompanied juveniles arriving at our borders has gone from about 6,000 to—the estimates I hear this year will be somewhere like 90,000 and may well reach 150,000 within the next year or two.

The administration, according to news reports and testimony, was actually warned about this in 2012 and 2013. Frankly, they didn't prepare for it. I am quite certain they didn't anticipate it.

They actually submitted a budget this year that called for cuts in many of the areas that we are clearly going to need to deal with this huge—and unanticipated, I guess, on their part—influx of unaccompanied juveniles.

Worth noting for the record, we actually restored a lot of those cuts in the foreign operations bill that has now cleared the full Appropriations Committee. I am glad we did.

The administration then, when confronted with this crisis which it did not anticipate, told us this was due to the 2008 sex trafficking law. Frankly, I am somewhat skeptical about that because this influx didn't happen in 2009, 2010, or 2011. It only begun to be remotely visible in 2012. That coincides, by the way, with some of the President's unilateral abrogation of immigration law.

I think that is probably more likely to be the cause, but regardless, the administration has pointed to the 2008 law. The President has done that. The Secretary of Homeland Security has done that.

So far, they have offered no formal solution, although in testimony before the Senate, the Secretary of Homeland Security said he would like the law changed, so that people arriving at our borders are treated the same way as Canadian and Mexican juveniles. That was his request, not a repeal of the law, but that was—at least in testimony—his suggestion.

The President has said that, regardless, the great majority of these children will eventually be returned home. He sent us a request recently to deal with the crisis in terms of the financial resources that he needs.

He did not send us a fix, he did not send us a proffered legislative solution, just simply a mechanism for money that would go around or go outside of the Ryan-Murray budget agreement that we had agreed upon.

What has been our response? I would be the first to acknowledge this is a difficult problem to deal with. That is why the administration, I presume, has not offered us a solution.

That is why the Senate, which tried to pass one yesterday, gave up and went home. It is not an easy problem. Indeed, yesterday, we weren't able to bring legislation to the floor that would actually address the problem.

The difference between this body and the other body is this body decided to stay here and continue to work on it and try to come up with a legislative response. That response, undoubtedly, will include a fix, a tweak, an amendment to the 2008 law.

If my friends have a better solution, then I would hope the administration or the Senate or somebody offers that. So far, it has been as if we blame the problem on the 2008 law, but we are told you can't change the 2008 law.

That position is both intellectually and politically, I think, indefensible. If this is the problem, tell us how to fix the problem. If you won't tell us, we will suggest one, and that is exactly what we are going to do.

We have also decided to look at the financial issue, and there is no question additional resources are needed to handle this influx, secure the border, add additional judges, and add additional courtroom facilities to handle an enormous backlog.

So we say, well, we are not going to give you a 13-month blank check, but we will redirect resources from within the existing budget toward what we agree is a more urgent problem, and we will help you get through this fiscal year and this calendar year, and then let's sit down and talk about what is necessary for fiscal year 2015 and try to do that within the Ryan-Murray budget agreement. I think that is what we are going to do.

So we are willing to work with the administration in these areas.

□ 1130

I would also suggest, at the end of the day, the worst thing we could do would be to go home and not do anything. My friends have suggested—and I think appropriately so—that you can't tell the President he is overreaching in one area and then is pulling back in another without providing legislative authority and legislative guidance. I think they are absolutely correct in that position. I have made that point myself both privately and publicly, but that is what we are going to try and accomplish. Hopefully, we can accomplish it today. If we do that today or this weekend, we will have done our part of the job. The Senate then, by the way, could reconvene and do its part of the job. Then we could go to conference, in working with the administration, and come up with something, but it does begin with somebody at least doing his job. That is what this House and that is what this majority is absolutely determined to do.

Mr. Speaker, there is not much more that can be said on a resolution that is only 10 lines long. This resolution is important so that we can consider possible legislation in a timely fashion related to the border crisis. I would urge my colleagues to support the rule.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 700 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

That immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 15) to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 2. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 15.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R–Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

The Republican majority may say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: ''Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.''

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: ''Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 184, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 474]

YEAS—226

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—184

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garcia
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey

Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—22

Campbell
Cantor
Clay
DesJarlais
Dingell
Fattah
Garamendi
Gowdy
Grayson
Green, Gene
Hanabusa
Kirkpatrick
McDermott
Miller, Gary
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Nunnelee
Ruiz
Rush
Schock
Speier

□ 1154

Messrs. VELA, SCHNEIDER, DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and McINTYRE changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 474 (On Ordering the Previous Question related to H. Res. 700), had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 219, noes 190, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 475]

AYES—219

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—190

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garcia
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—23

Bilirakis
Campbell
Cantor
Clay
DesJarlais
Dingell
Fattah
Garamendi
Gowdy
Grayson
Green, Gene
Hanabusa
Kirkpatrick
McDermott
Miller, Gary
Moran
Nadler
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Ruiz
Rush
Schock
Speier

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1202

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 475 (On Agreeing to the Resolution related to H. Res. 700), had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 475, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 474 & 475, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3548. An act to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to expand the definition of trauma to include thermal, electrical, chemical, radioactive, and other extrinsic agents.

H.R. 4360. An act to designate the facility of the United States Forest Service for the Grandfather Ranger District located at 109 Lawing Drive in Nebo, North Carolina, as the ''Jason Crisp Forest Service Building''.

H.R. 4631. An act to reauthorize certain provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to autism, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4838. An act to redesignate the railroad station located at 2955 Market Street in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, commonly known as ''30th Street Station'', as the ''William H. Gray III 30th Street Station''.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill and a joint resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 231. An act to reauthorize the Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp.

S.J. Res. 36. Joint resolution relating to the approval and implementation of the proposed agreement for nuclear cooperation between the United States and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1735

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
Washington, DC, August 1, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on August 1, 2014 at 12:13 p.m.:

That the Senate passed with amendments H.J. Res. 76.

With best wishes, I am.

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 1, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on August 1, 2014 at 4:17 p.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 4386.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 5195.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 606.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1671.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2291.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 3472.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 3765.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the following enrolled bills were signed by the Speaker on Friday, August 1, 2014:

H.R. 3230, to improve the access of veterans to medical services from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5021, to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 76) making continuing appropriations for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a single motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendments; the Senate amendments be considered as read; the previous question be considered as ordered on the motion to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question; and the Chair may postpone the question of adoption of the motion as though under clause 8 of rule XX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of today, I call up H.J. Res. 76, with the Senate amendments thereto.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the Senate amendments.

The text of the Senate amendments is as follows:

Senate amendments:

Strike all after the first word, and insert:

the following sum is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

PROCUREMENT

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for ''Procurement, Defense-Wide'', $225,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, which shall be for the Secretary of Defense to provide to the Government of Israel for the procurement of the Iron Dome defense system to counter short-range rocket threats: Provided, That such funds shall be transferred immediately only through an exchange of letters to address emergent operations in support of Operation Protective Edge, notwithstanding section 3.1.3.2.1 of the U.S.-Israel Iron Dome Procurement Agreement: Provided further, That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to apply to previously appropriated funds for the procurement of Iron Dome: Provided further, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

This joint resolution may be cited as the ''Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Resolution, 2014''.

Amend the title so as to read: ''A bill making an emergency supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, to provide funding to Israel for the Iron Dome defense system to counter short-range rocket threats.''.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky moves that the House concur in the Senate amendments to House Joint Resolution 76.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, proceedings on this question will be postponed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5230, SECURE THE SOUTHWEST BORDER ACT OF 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5272, PROHIBITIONS RELATING TO DEFERRED ACTION FOR ALIENS; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–571) on the resolution (H. Res. 710) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5230) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5272) to prohibit certain actions with respect to deferred action for aliens not lawfully present in the United States, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5230, THE SECURE THE SOUTHWEST BORDER ACT OF 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5272, PROHIBITIONS RELATING TO DEFERRED ACTION FOR ALIENS; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 710 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES 710

Resolved, That during further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5230) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 696:

(a) the amendments printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted;

(b) all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived; and

(c) the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except (1) one additional hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. After passage of H.R. 5230, and on the legislative day of August 1, 2014, the House shall consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5272) to prohibit certain actions with respect to deferred action for aliens not lawfully present in the United States, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. Section 2 of House Resolution 700 is amended to read as follows: ''Sec. 2. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of August 1, 2014, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules, as though under clause 1 of rule XV, relating to a measure addressing missile defense of Israel.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), my friend, the ranking member from the Rules Committee, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. The rule provides for expedited consideration of H.R. 5230 and H.R. 5272.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today because we are facing an unprecedented crisis on America's southern border. Nearly 60,000 unaccompanied alien children have entered the United States illegally this fiscal year, most of whom have come through the Texas-Mexico border, and today, our country faces a threat to our sovereignty and to our rule of law.

The time to act is now. It would be irresponsible for this body to go home for a month without doing our part to help work and solve this problem. I am glad that Members of the House recognize their duty to finish the job. I believe the House has put specific, concrete proposals to act in the best interest of the United States.

Let's take a look at what this crisis on our border is doing. First, the President's catch-and-release program is a big part of the problem. Under this program, nearly 90 percent of unaccompanied alien children have been placed with their families in the United States, many of whom are here illegally themselves.

Second, there is the President's DACA program. DACA is a major reason for the influx of illegal immigrants to the United States. The Director on U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services recently testified to the Judiciary Committee that 700,000 undocumented immigrants have taken advantage of DACA.

Third, there is the 2008 trafficking law, which has allowed so many to effectively skip out on the judicial process and live in our country illegally. Catch and release under the President's proposal is wrong and bad for our country, and only encourages many, many more to continue the trek here.

□ 1745

Combined, these policies, plus signals from the administration, encouraged more illegal immigration and have led to the border crisis that we face today. To stop this crisis, our border must be secured and the tide of illegal immigration should be stemmed. I believe that this rule provides for legislation to accomplish that goal.

H.R. 5230 would provide $659 million for border security, the enforcement of existing laws, illegal immigration prevention, and humanitarian assistance. Additionally, $70 million would be provided for National Guard border efforts. This proposal is paid for, which means that it does not result in any new or additional Federal spending this fiscal year.

However, the House will not simply throw money at the problem. This package also makes specific, concrete policy changes to address the underlying problems that are fueling this crisis. Specifically, it prevents the administration from spending taxpayer dollars to adjudicate any new applications under DACA or any other similar policy. The package also amends the 2008 trafficking law so that all unaccompanied alien children are treated the same as, under the law today, Mexicans and Canadians, and this is for the purpose of removals.

It also provides additional temporary judges to help guarantee that these children get their day in court within 14 days from their initial screening. It also strengthens laws against criminals and those with serious drug-related convictions and those who have them from applying for asylum. It allows for customs and border protection activities on Federal land. Similarly, it authorizes the deployment of the National Guard to our southern border.

Finally, it prohibits the housing of unauthorized immigrants on military bases if housing them would displace members of the Armed Forces or any Active Duty or it interferes with military activity.

These steps come after a series of conversations with members of the majority. We have an obligation to get this bill done. As a Texan, I have pushed and pushed and pushed for us to make sure that we had a bill that could be supported by our Members. It is Texas and those living on the border that are seeing tremendous conditions that are placing our States and local people at a disadvantage.

Thus, I want to thank the Members for continuing to work together on a bill to get 218 votes. I applaud those who spent the time, including today, dedicating themselves to putting the package together. I thank the staff. And as always, I expect and want this body to support this good piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague for yielding, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

You would think after 4 years that the majority would know how to run the House, but this week makes us wonder. All we have accomplished this week is to sue the President and deregulate pesticides into the environment. And in a real embarrassment, canceling a vote because Tea Party Members refused to support a border bill that was tailormade for them. Actually, I understand it was in their interest to pass it yesterday.

Now, my colleague, of whom I am inordinately fond, said that the time to act is now. But the time really to act was yesterday when the Senate was in town, because there is no way now what we are doing today could ever become legislation because the Senate would have to pass something, and then it would go to the President who said already he would veto it. So we stay an extra day here to make a point.

Instead of going home to our constituents, we are under siege in a choke hold by some Members of the House. This much is true: it costs the taxpayers $24 million a week to run the House of Representatives, and I am afraid the American people aren't getting their money's worth.

President Truman, it is worth noting, campaigned for President using a quote ''do-nothing Congress,'' which had passed nearly 1,000 bills. And under Mr. Speaker, this Congress has passed just around 120. Mr. Truman was mad because they had not done a health care bill. Fortunately, we got that done 4 years ago.

But this recalcitrant Congress is why President Obama had to act on his own. Nothing is working here, but he was responsible for keeping the country moving. I think we need to describe for the RECORD and for the public exactly what has been done today.

This morning, the majority adopted a martial law rule until September 5, which is most unusual. Martial law usually lasts 1, 2, maybe 3 days at the outside. But we have 5 weeks, which means the Speaker can call us back at any time. We would hope that he would not do that without telling us what we are going to do. But today, we do not even know what is in this bill. We don't understand this legislation because the 40 pages of it we have not had time to look at. So here we are. We do think it is pretty toxic.

But not only was the bill drafted by Republicans only, in a basement room, there are absolutely no Democrat fingerprints or ideas or amendments or thoughts or suggestions or hopes or anything else in this bill. There have been no hearings, no markups, no amendments, nothing of which we are entitled to as Members of the House and sent here by 750,000 Americans.

This bill, we know, does give $35 million to reimburse the National Guard for activities related to ''border security and the current influx of illegal immigrants.'' Now it turns out that only Texas has spent any money on that, and one wonders if that piqued Senator CRUZ's interest in this bill and what we are doing over here because it looks like that is where the money will be going.

The bill tragically cuts all funding for the DREAM Act, the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program. We were told there were something like 700,000 children who were involved in that, who came forward on a promise by this government that they would have an opportunity to go to school and they would not be deported. Now the country has their names, their addresses, and they would be easy to deport because this bill puts an end to the DREAM Act.

I related today in the Rules Committee a story about four undocumented young men in high school in the United States that decided to enter into a contest to build an underwater robot, the trouble that they had simply getting the equipment to do it and the teachers who helped them do it. And they really felt that they had been outmatched and outgunned when they were going to compete as high school students against engineering students at MIT, a premier engineering school in the United States. What happened, those four young men won. They beat MIT. Now, they were part of the DREAM Act. We hope they will not be deported because, more than anything I can think of, the United States needs that kind of thinkers and innovators in what they had to do.

So the Cato Institute agrees. They wrote on July 29, 3 days ago, that DACA, the DREAM Act, was not a primary cause of the surge, and I insert this report from CATO, entitled, ''DACA Did Not Cause the Surge in Unaccompanied Children,'' into the RECORD. I will also submit some statistical findings from Professor Tim Wong, from the University of California, San Diego, into the RECORD, entitled, ''DACA Did Not Cause the Influx of Unaccompanied Minors'' into the RECORD.

[From the CATO Institute, July 29, 2014]

DACA DID NOT CAUSE THE SURGE IN UNACCOMPANIED CHILDREN

(By Alex Nowrasteh)

In June, 2012 the Obama Administration announced that it had authored a memo deferring the deportation of unauthorized immigrant childhood arrivals in the United States, a program known as deferred action for childhood arrivals (DACA). The memo directed then Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security to practice prosecutorial discretion toward a small number of unauthorized immigrants who fulfilled a specific set of characteristics. In essence, some unauthorized immigrants who had come to the United States as children were able to legally stay and work—at least temporarily.

DID DACA CAUSE THE UAC SURGE?

Some politicians contend that DACA is primarily responsible for the surge in unaccompanied child (UAC) migrants across the border in recent years. A recent House Appropriations Committee one-pager stated that, ''The dire situation on our Southern border has been exacerbated by the President's current immigration policies.'' Proponents of this theory argue that DACA sent a message to Central Americans that if they came as children then the U.S. government would legalize them, thus giving a large incentive for them to come in the first place. Few facts of the unaccompanied children (UAC) surge are consistent with the theory that DACA caused the surge.

First, the surge in UAC began long before the June 15, 2012 announcement of DACA. It is true that DACA had been discussed in late May 2012 but the surge was underway by that time. From October 2011 through March 2012, there was a 93 percent increase in UAC apprehensions over the same period in Fiscal Year 2011. Texas Governor Rick Perry warned President Obama about the rapid increase in UAC at the border in early May 2012—more than a full month before DACA was announced. In early June 2012, Mexico was detaining twice as many Central American children as in 2011. The surge in unaccompanied children (UAC) began before DACA was announced.

Second, the children coming now are not legally able to apply for DACA. A recipient of DACA has to have resided in the United States continuously from June 15, 2007 to June 15, 2012, a requirement that excludes the unaccompanied children coming now.

Third, if DACA was such an incentive for UAC to come from Central America, why are so few Nicaraguan children coming? They would benefit in the same way as unaccompanied children from El Salvdaor, Honduras, and Guatemala. The lack of Nicaraguans points to other causes of the surge.

The timing, legal exclusion of the UAC from DACA, and lack of Nicaraguans indicate that DACA was not a primary cause of the surge. Of the 404 UAC interviewed by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees since 2011, only 9 mentioned that U.S. laws influenced their decision to come to the United States. Other American laws could have influenced the unaccompanied children to come but DACA is not the main culprit.

DETAILS ON DACA

The DACA beneficiaries, at the time of the memo, would have to fulfill all of these requirements to have their deportations deferred: under the age of 31; arrived to the United States before reaching their 16th birthday; entered the United States without inspection or overstayed a visa prior to June 15, 2012; continuously resided in the United States from June 15, 2007 to the time of the memo; physically present in the United States on June 15, 2012, as well as at the time of requesting deferred action from United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS); been in school at the time of application, or have already graduated or obtained a certificate of completion from high school, or have obtained a general education development (GED) certificate, or are an honorably discharged veteran of the U.S. Coast Guard or the U.S. Armed Forces; not been convicted of a felony, significant misdemeanor, or three or more other misdemeanors, and do not otherwise pose a threat to national security or public safety.

Beneficiaries of DACA were also allowed to apply for employment authorization according to the Code of Federal Regulations. There is a debate amongst legal scholars over whether the administration's grant of deferred action was legal. Those who argue that DACA was illegal contend that the President overstepped his constitutional authority to defer the deportation of some unauthorized immigrants. Those who argue that DACA was legal point to the general power of the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security to defer enforcement action. They argue that the Supreme Court has ruled that decisions to initiate or terminate enforcement proceedings fall within the authority of the Executive—an enforcement power used since the early 1970s. Here is more of their argument. This disagreement has not been settled.

By the end of September, 2013, 580,000 requests for DACA were accepted by the U.S. government and 514,800, or 89 percent, were approved. Seventy-six percent of the requests came from Mexicans. Twenty-nine percent of the requests were filed from California, 16 percent from Texas, and 6 percent from Illinois.

Read the Full Article: DACA Did Not Cause the Surge in Unaccompanied Children

---

DACA DID NOT CAUSE THE INFLUX OF UNACCOMPANIED MINORS

Statistical analysis from a political science professor, Tom Wong, from the University of California, San Diego shows that violence is causing the surge of unaccompanied children crossing the border.

Central American countries that are experiencing high levels of violence (Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador) have seen thousands of children flee, other countries with lower

levels of violence (Nicaragua, Belize) are not facing same outflow. This takes into consideration poverty levels as well, given that Nicaragua is the poorest country in the Central American region.

Professor Wong analyzed data from the United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and the CBP apprehension rate of unaccompanied children and found a direct correlation between the homicide rate in Honduras, El Salvador and Guatemala and the entry of UACs.

The United States is not the only country in the region experiencing an increase in protection claims from people from El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras.

According to UNHCR, the United Nations Refugee Agency, other countries in the region have experienced a sharp increase in the number of asylum applications filed by Salvadorans, Guatemalans, and Hondurans since 2008. From 2008 to 2013, the number of such applications filed in Mexico, Panama, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Belize increased by 712%.

The initial increase in unaccompanied minor entries occurred well before the implementation of the DACA program in June 2012.

If DACA was the cause for the increase in unaccompanied minors, we would see more entries from countries around the world—instead the children are only coming from three countries: Honduras, El Salvador and Guatemala. All of these countries have high rates of violence.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. What is really happening here is the most extreme, anti-immigrant voices in the Republican Party using the crisis as a political cover to repeal a commonsense policy like the DREAM Act, and the Speaker has caved once again to those voices. Representative STEVE KING described the underlying legislation as something that he could have ordered off the menu.

Furthermore, the rules are of course closed, setting the record anew for the most closed rules in any Congress. This bill does stop short of catapulting those children into Mexico and then leaving them to walk to their home countries, but it certainly doesn't do very much since the discussion in the House of Representatives for several years now has been what to do about immigration. It really is a sorry path that we have reached the condition we are in right now, a one-House bill, a Senate that is gone, and a President who won't sign it.

If we learned anything this week, we learned from Speaker BOEHNER's comments on his blog that the President should do more, not less, contrary to the reason why they sued him, and we do hope that the President will do that and bring a more humane solution to this, as almost all religions in the United States have asked us to do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to just say one of the things I learned this week was that the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) presented not only her thoughts and ideas at our conference when we met about how we can make our borders stronger, but she was present the entire time at the Rules Committee, had a chance to forthrightly participate. We had hours and hours of discussion about not only the legislation and what we were doing, but we actually shared ideas among Members on a bipartisan basis today, and I felt like it was a pretty good exchange.

I am delighted, at this time, to yield 15 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, young children are being sent off alone or put in the hands of criminal cartels to cross vast, inhospitable spaces in the hopes of eventually reaching our border. This is a humanitarian crisis. Today we seek to address the plight of these children in a responsible fashion.

There has been much discussion in the House this week about constitutional role. The President has acknowledged his constitutional role in immigration policy. In 2011, speaking to a meeting of La Raza, he said:

> I swore an oath to uphold the laws on the books . . . Now, I know some people want me to bypass Congress and change the laws on my own. Believe me, the idea of doing things on my own is very tempting, I promise you, not just on immigration reform. But that's not how our system works. That is not how our democracy functions. That's not how our Constitution is written.

If the President's actions had remained consistent with these words, we would not be facing the crisis we are today. Unfortunately, though, the President did take it upon himself to unilaterally rewrite immigration law, and he did so in a way that aggravated the situation. And he knew the potential consequences. In 2010, the President said:

> There are those in the immigrants' rights community who have argued passionately that we should simply provide those who are here illegally with legal status, or at least ignore the law on the books and put an end to deportation until we have better laws . . . but I believe such an indiscriminate approach would be both unwise and unfair. It would suggest to those thinking about coming here illegally that there would be no repercussions for such a decision. And this could lead to a surge in more illegal immigration.

Despite his clear foresight on this issue, the President still unilaterally suspended deportation to select illegal aliens. His predicted surge quickly became a reality. Now young border crossers are setting off on harrowing, costly journeys under the belief that, upon arrival, they will receive a ''permiso,'' permission to stay in our great country.

The motivation for illegally crossing the border is understandable. I join my colleagues who have recognized the uniquely generous and welcoming nature of this great country. As a mother and grandmother, I am moved by the plight of these young children. As a granddaughter of immigrants, I am grateful that this country has welcomed generations of tired and poor and given them the chance to breathe free. And as a lawmaker, I recognize that the foundation of American generosity and freedom is the rule of law.

Today, through a constitutionally prescribed process, we have the opportunity to pass a bill that will give the President the tools to address this crisis.

Today, we can provide resources to secure the border and ensure that those who have already undertaken this journey can be speedily reunited with their families.

Today, we can send a clear, compassionate message that undertaking this border crossing journey is a mistake.

Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this rule and the underlying legislation so that we can begin to solve this problem.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the ranking member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security and an expert on immigration.

□ 1800

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, some have been asking whether this bill repeals DACA and puts the DREAMers back in deportation, and the answer is yes. Page 1, lines 5 through 17 point out that no funds can be used for a new application.

The DACA applications were a granted deferred action for 2 years. They must make a new application—and there is no guarantee that application will be approved—at the end of 2 years. That is beginning now. So this will require that the DREAMers be removed from deferred action and become subject to deportation.

Further, the bill is meant to treat all children the way we treat Mexican children, but it does more than that. Right now, the Border Patrol is required to determine on a case-by-case basis whether a child has the capacity—whether they are old enough—to independently withdraw an application. That is stricken in this bill.

The law says now that a Mexican child who raises no persecution or trafficking concerns may be permitted to withdraw an application and voluntarily return home if the child is able to make the decision. This bill changes the law to say that a child may be permitted to withdraw an application, but, in the event, the child shall be returned. It doesn't matter whether the child has the ability to make a decision. No matter what, that kid is going home. So that is new.

Current law says that even Mexican children can request to see an immigration judge, but this bill says that is not the case. It makes the CBP person performing the screening the judge, juror, and, in some cases, the executioner.

It is worth pointing out that this is not just about kids from Honduras or Mexico. We will be returning the Thai child sex slave back to her traffickers; the Christian child from Syria who has

found asylum here in the United States, that child immediately returned; the Chinese teen fleeing forced abortion from China, that child immediately returned.

This is an outrageously unconscionable bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ennis, Texas (Mr. BARTON), the dean of the Texas delegation.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. SESSIONS. I hope we will yield back some of that time.

First, I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the leadership you have exhibited, not just in the Rules Committee, but on this issue in general. You have been a longtime advocate of substantive immigration reform in a conservative way. You have been active this week in the Conference and in the Texas delegation as we attempt to move this legislation. And, of course, you have been very active this afternoon in the Rules Committee.

I want to also compliment the leadership of the majority as we have tried to craft a compassionate conservative path forward. I happen to be an advocate of comprehensive immigration reform. I have a draft bill that I have been waiting until the right time to introduce, and, hopefully, get bipartisan support. I am not one of these ''just say no'' Republicans.

Having said that, we have a crisis on our southern border because of some actions the President has taken in the past and some inactions that he is not taking now. We have got this terrible situation where thousands and thousands of young children—some unaccompanied, by themselves, others with adults—who have been flooding the southern border, allegedly some of them paying thousands of dollars to individuals who are allegedly related to the drug cartels. It is an unsustainable situation, Mr. Speaker. It can't go on.

The bill that is going to be before the body later this evening targets funding to add additional judges to review these children on a case-by-case basis. It reverses current law so that children from noncontiguous countries are treated the same as the children from Canada and Mexico who perhaps attempt to come into the country without proper documentation. I don't think it is an inhumane thing to do, Mr. Speaker. I think it is actually the right thing to do.

The bill before us is going to have funds to reimburse the States that have decided to deploy their National Guardsmen to the border. One of those States is my State of Texas. This bill would target funding to reimburse the State of Texas for the cost of deploying the National Guard. I think that is a good thing.

The bill before us is going to be completely offset, taking money that has already been appropriated but not expended. The offsets are not fake, they are not: in the 10th year we will theoretically save some money that would have otherwise been spent. These offsets are for funds that have been appropriated and have been obligated but not used. Some of those funds are in the foreign aid accounts of the countries that are sending us some of their citizens, and I think that is appropriate.

We can have a debate at the appropriate time on a more comprehensive package. That is obviously something that at some point I hope this body addresses. I am going to be an active, positive participant in that, Mr. Speaker.

But for today, to solve the current situation on the border, this is a targeted package. It will be better than current law if it is enacted. It will improve the situation, I think, within the next 2 months. If it were to be enacted in its totality, you would basically not have the problem of the unaccompanied minor children or minors with adults that are flooding our borders. It is a conservative approach. I will tell my friends on the minority side, I happen to be proud of that. I believe that the body is going to pass this. I am going to vote for both bills, the appropriation supplemental and then the DACA bill that Congresswoman BLACKBURN has expressed leadership on and done such a good job on, and of which I am a cosponsor.

I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee for giving me some time. I strongly support the rule, and I will vote for the underlying bills.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), my friend, and a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from New York for yielding.

''Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses, yearning to breathe free.'' Those words appear on the Statue of Liberty that stands tall in New York Harbor.

Today, we are here in this Chamber doing violence to a model that has served this country well. We have a humanitarian crisis in this country: tens of thousands of unaccompanied children have fled violence in Central America and migrated to our southern border.

Our response has not been consistent with the notion that America is a country of individuals from all over the world, and a compassionate one.

Lady Liberty is crying right now because of the callous response of House Republicans. Some of the children who have come here may not have a valid legal basis to remain, but some will. If a child has a credible fear of persecution; if a child was abused, abandoned, or neglected by a parent; if a child was victimized by a highly violent criminal act and suffered emotional or physical damage, under current law they have a valid legal basis to remain. House Republicans are threatening to take that away, inconsistent with our values.

That is why I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule and on the underlying legislation.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Tyler, Texas, Judge GOHMERT, a former State district judge, now Member of Congress.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman SESSIONS.

This was a different experience the last few days. I remember the fiscal cliff problem when we were told: Here is your remedy, take it and like it. And they didn't have enough votes so it ended up getting pulled, and people were sent home.

But this time was different. We had people who said: Do you know what? Wait a minute, why don't we stay here and work something out? Kind of a refreshing change.

There were numerous Members last night that sat down in a room and worked for quite some time—for hours actually—and came to a conclusion. We had a verbal agreement, and there was a misunderstanding on one provision. Anyway, there were so many great changes, great compromises, people from different, diverse positions took part.

But let me just say, the importance of getting something done now before we get even one day further into August is this. I have spent many days and many nights on the border. When you look at the pitiful, beautiful little faces of people that have come 1,000 or more miles because there was a shiny object being dangled here in the United States, saying: Come on, you may get amnesty, come on, come on now; and adults paid gang members, paid drug cartels, to bring these people through—some got pulled off into sexual trafficking we are told, many were raped, if they were young women, along the way, some given birth control pills so, gee, if they are raped they are not getting pregnant—and all because the law has been violated in an unconstitutional action by the President, who said: I don't like the law that was passed by the House and by the Senate and then the prior President signed into law, so I am passing a new law through my lips. And it created this allure.

I wish the Senate had stuck around to work with us, as many of us stayed last night to work. We could be so far down the road.

I am greatly encouraged by many of the things that are here, by the great compromises.

I want to thank KEVIN MCCARTHY, STEVE SCALISE, PATRICK MCHENRY, Chairman BOB GOODLATTE, the Judiciary staff, but especially Chairman SESSIONS. Thanks for your accorded assistance today.

We could get to a finished product even with the Senate if it wasn't HARRY REID's way or the highway.

Who suffers? Come some night with me and sit out at the border 1, 2, 3 in

the morning, dodge tarantulas scorpions, rattlesnakes, and you may get to see a beautiful face that has gone through hell instead of being accorded the decency of a better way to immigrate into America.

We can do a better job, and we haven't done our job.

I am going to be a ''no'' because the provision was not pulled out that gives the Attorney General the power to appoint the 40 judges that are going to deal with the issues on the border. I have been assured we are going to work on that in the future to fix it better. I just can't give a guy in contempt the ability to appoint the 40 judges to deal with this issue. But I am so grateful for the process that we are now starting to use.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, there is one really good idea in this bill, and that is the $40 million that is going to be used to help repatriate kids with their families. This is what ideally should happen. Children want to be with their parents in their own country. I thank KAY GRANGER for her leadership on this.

Regrettably, the rest of the bill is a mess. Just think about it: $70 million to the National Guard. Why are we seriously thinking that we have to have combat-ready troops at the border to greet 9- and 10- and 11-year-old kids, who, if they made the journey successfully, are famished, exhausted, and terrified?

□ 1815

Also, $405 million to the Department of Homeland Security—they have got a big budget, and there is not any evidence that this will make a dime's worth of difference.

What this really does is raise the question: Where did this bill come from? Yesterday, we were all on our way home. Some Members were at the airport. There was no bill yesterday, but then people figured out if the House didn't even act on a bill, we wouldn't be able to blame the do-nothing Senate—but, Mr. Speaker, wait.

The do-nothing Senate passed comprehensive immigration reform on June 27, 2013. The do-nothing Senate passed that bill in a bipartisan manner, 68–32. The get-the-job-done House hasn't even taken that bill up, even though it has been here for over 13 months.

This bill has a House designation on it, but bills usually get considered by committees. We had no committee hearing, no consultation with any Democrats, no consultation with the President—basically, no consultation with other Republican Members of the House.

We should kill this bill. We should put our best folks together, like GRANGER, BARTON, GUTIÉRREZ, and LOFGREN, and do the right thing.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 15 seconds for a clarification of his remarks, if he would take me up on that time.

I would like to advise the gentleman that I do not believe it is a correct statement to say combat-ready troops. The National Guard that is in Texas is not all combat ready. If I could get the gentleman to correct that, I yield him 15 seconds.

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman. I know we are all proud of our Guard. Our Guard in Vermont lost more lives per capita in Afghanistan and Iraq, and many of our Guard members, as you know, played that role. So I do think of our Guardsmen and -women across the country as prepared to do whatever they are asked to do, including combat.

Mr. SESSIONS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to let the RECORD note that there is no specification for these men and women of the National Guard to be combat ready. In fact, I do not believe that that would be a true statement.

That is not a part of what we have specified in this plan, nor do I believe that it would be a requirement. So I have asked the gentleman, and he chose to answer the way he did, but I would like to state on the RECORD that there are no requirements, there is no precondition for that. In fact, I do not believe that that is a correct statement.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY), one of our newest Members.

Mr. JOLLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I am one of the newest Members, and I have to tell you it is amusing to find the paradox on the other side of the aisle that, yesterday, we were being criticized for not considering a bill. Today, we are being criticized for considering a bill.

I sat in my office, just like many others today, and watched the President of the United States attempt to admonish the House for working. I want to make something very clear to the American people tonight. The President's plan for the crisis on the border was rejected not just by this body, but by the Senate.

There is not a majority in the Senate or in the House willing to consider and approve the President's plan for the crisis on the border. That plan is dead on arrival, with a majority in the Senate controlled by his own party and a majority in this House, and so the Senate brought up its bill, and it was rejected.

The Senate, controlled by the President's party, left town. This House, this body, this Congress, this caucus, is working.

I am new to this body, and I find it fascinating that the media and the pundits and the consultants can take a set of facts and suggest that, because we are working together, somehow we are dysfunctional.

That is an absurdity. We are working. What is dysfunctional is the other side of this Capitol. What is dysfunctional is the other side of Pennsylvania Avenue. This body is working.

We are sitting here complaining on both sides of the aisle—some in my own caucus—about what is not in this bill, but the fact is what is in this bill is the right solution. This is a good bill, and I would say to the folks on my side of the aisle, I know a lot of folks have concerns about this.

For conservatives, this is the bill we have been asking for, for years. This is a responsible, commonsense approach that says if you come here illegally, you will be returned into the responsible and caring hands of your government, and frankly, let's put in the hands of everybody a packet that says how to immigrate here legally.

We are a loving and caring Nation, and we are better for that, but we are also a Nation of laws. This bill says enforce the law. It is accountability. That is all it is.

Where the President has proposed nearly $4 billion, this body has proposed less than $700 million, fully offset by cuts to other Federal programs. This is a conservative bill. It pays for itself. It is about enforcement. It is about accountability.

Lastly, I will say this as a new Member of this body. I admit my naivete. I am a Pollyanna. I actually believe this body can work. I believe what is good and right about this body. I believe we can work.

Let me tell you why we ended up here today and we didn't get a bill done yesterday is because we have Rs and Ds next to our names. If we drop the Rs and Ds, we had enough votes last night to pass this bill. We know it on both sides of the aisle.

This is a commonsense bill that addresses the priorities of the American people, and if we were here yesterday not as Republicans and Democrats, but as Members of Congress that know what is right for the future of this country, we could have passed this bill yesterday.

So instead of complaining yesterday that we didn't pass a bill and complaining today that we are here working on a Friday night to pass a bill, we can keep it honest, drop the partisanship, and pass what the American people expect, which is responsibility and accountability and commonsense solutions. That is why we are here tonight.

I think we need to pass this bill. I think every Member of Congress should pass this bill. This is a good bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, the influx of unaccompanied children across the southern border is a serious humanitarian situation that requires immediate action. We desperately need Members of Congress to work together in a bipartisan way to develop an effective and humane course of action to address this problem, and I am disappointed that we are playing politics

with this crisis instead of developing solutions.

The rule we are considering today would allow us to consider two bills. The supplemental appropriations bill is an irresponsible funding measure that fails to address the true needs of this crisis while also making irresponsible cuts of over $400 million to FEMA's disaster relief fund, impacting the Federal response to disasters.

The other bill needlessly punishes innocent children, known as DREAMers, and would do nothing to address the humanitarian situation caused by violence in Central America. This deportation-only and enforcement-only approach to changing our Nation's immigration law is misguided and will do absolutely nothing to prevent our broken system from spinning further into dysfunction.

In my district, there are businesses, farmers, faith leaders, law enforcement leaders, and families who have been asking Congress for years to find solutions to our broken immigration system.

I helped introduce a comprehensive immigration reform bill, H.R. 15, to help these constituents who deserve a functional immigration system that they can rely on; instead, House Republicans have decided to make today's divisive bill a priority. They want to make sure that absolutely nothing is done to improve overall our immigration system.

After more than a year of refusing to act on comprehensive legislation, this is unacceptable, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend, the gentlewoman from New York, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, someplace I read in the Bible, ''Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me; for of such is the kingdom of heaven''—or it could have read the beloved community or the beloved Nation.

Mr. Speaker, at this moment, at this hour, we have a moral obligation, a mission, and a mandate to do the right thing, the humane thing. Today, hundreds and thousands of our children—innocent little children—need our help. They need our support. They are running away from violence, from rape, from hunger. They are searching for a better life.

The time has arrived, Mr. Speaker. We can wait no longer. We have reached a tipping point, and now, we have a choice, a choice to do what is right, what is just, what is fair. Where are our hearts? Where are our souls? We cannot simply turn our backs on these little children and do nothing.

In the final analysis, we are one people, one family, one House. It doesn't matter whether you are Black, White, Asian American, Native American, or Latino. There is no such thing as an illegal human being.

History will not be kind to us if we fail to do what is right, what is just. We must pass bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform, and we must pass it now.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, who are these young people across America that these Republicans would deny a dream, whose lives they are so eager to disrupt tonight?

Maria Rocha is one of them. She came here as a 3-year-old. I have rallied with this young, articulate woman in San Antonio for reform on several occasions. The first time Maria even knew she was an immigrant was when she was unable to apply for college financial assistance, so she worked three jobs. And because of the President's DACA executive order, she was able to graduate from UTSA. Now, she is teaching kindergarten.

Another is Sheridan Aguirre. He was brought here as a 1-year-old. He told me:

> I was encouraged to go to college, but my legal status made it difficult for me to plan. Two years ago, I graduated as valedictorian of my high school and entered UT, where I have a 3.77 grade point average. Because of the President's executive order, I work, I own a car, I pay my rent, I can travel, I am sustainable, and I can live without fear. I need DACA so that I can go to graduate school and fulfill my career goals. Repealing DACA would be a huge step backwards for our country's history.

Republicans would deny the right to learn, the right to work—and they would deny the dream. They would deny the hope for these young people and thousands of others across this country, who pledge allegiance to America, and have so much to contribute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. You may call this amnesty. I call it a hope for our country. You can call it conservative. I call it wasteful. It wastes talent that this Nation needs.

We need to reject this mean-spirited legislation that would deny rights to these young ,people who are already contributing to our country and can give it so much more. We can't afford this wasteful bill. I urge its rejection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would notify the gentlewoman from New York that I have no further speakers, and I have been advised that perhaps she has no further speakers.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, that is true. We have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, in the more than a year since the Senate passed bipartisan immigration reform, the House leadership has refused to allow a vote on this essential legislation, even though we know it has the votes to pass.

□ 1830

Indeed, over the last 13 months, the majority has not taken one step—not one—to fix our broken immigration system. If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 15, our immigration reform bill, already passed by the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no,'' defeat the previous question, and vote ''no'' on the underlying bills.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I also appreciate the gentlewoman, her team, and all of our staffs who have worked overtime, including our Appropriations staff and our staff from Energy and Commerce who helped us with this, as well as the Judiciary staff.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I have a fundamental disagreement with the President on the question of the border, and that is why we are here today.

You have heard Republican speakers talking about how we believe that the rule of law is important. We believe that America is a great and awesome country and that we are very compassionate, but we take in millions of people each year through a legal process. America is a land of immigrants, but the rule of law is important also. We have problems with our borders. We have had problems with our borders for years, but in particular, after 9/11, the threats that are against this country have placed enormous pressure not only on our law enforcement but on air, land, sea, rail. We feel that the Federal Government should do a better job of not encouraging people to come to this country, bypassing the laws and laying down enforcement and making it easier for our country to be invaded.

That is what is happening right now.

Some 70,000 people have come to our border, and Republicans are standing up and are talking about this in a proper way. We believe that the people who have come here should be allowed to go back home. We should help them, and we should facilitate that. We believe that the rule of law—the processes that we have got to follow to do that—must be followed.

Yesterday, there was an amendment before the Rules Committee asking for almost $180 million to help pay for these children who, as the guests of the Democratic Party and the President, will stay in this country. We are going

to have to end up paying about—$180 million was the request, for 60 days for our local school districts.

There are enormous questions that abound about what will happen, who will pay, how this is supposed to happen when, in fact, America at this time has 25 million people unemployed and underemployed. It is a tremendous deficit that we face. Our social systems and networks are burdened already, and we have many people whom, ourselves, we cannot help—but what do we do? We take on more people.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that we listen to the American people and that we listen to what we are trying to do here, and that is to face up to what we were sent here to do, which is to make tough choices and tough decisions. I believe what we are doing is correct. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the resolution and ''yes'' on the underlying legislation.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 710 OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

Sec. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R.15) to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

Sec. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 15.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

The Republican majority may say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: ''Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule.. . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.''

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: ''Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 183, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 476]

YEAS—226

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—183

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo

Esty
Farr
Foster
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garcia
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—23

Blumenauer
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Davis (CA)
DesJarlais
Doggett
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Gene
Hanabusa
Kennedy
McDermott
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Ruiz
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schock
Speier
Waxman

□ 1858

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Ms. MOORE changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. GOSAR changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 476, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 191, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 477]

YEAS—218

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—191

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garcia
Gosar
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—23

Blumenauer
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Chaffetz
Davis (CA)
DesJarlais
Fattah
Garamendi
Gohmert
Grayson
Green, Gene
Hanabusa
Kennedy
McDermott
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Ruiz
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schock
Speier
Waxman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1907

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote 476, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

On rollcall vote 477, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

SECURE THE SOUTHWEST BORDER ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 5230 will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 710, the amendments printed in part A of House Report 113–571 are adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 5230

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

DIVISION A—SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for ''Salaries and Expenses'', $71,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, for necessary expenses to apprehend, transport, and provide temporary shelter associated with the significant rise in unaccompanied alien children and alien adults accompanied by an alien minor at the Southwest Border of the United States, including related activities to secure the border, disrupt transnational crime, and the necessary acquisition, construction, improvement, repair, and management of facilities: *Provided*, That not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate an obligation and quarterly expenditure plan for these funds: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall provide to such Committees quarterly updates on the expenditure of these funds.

U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for ''Salaries and Expenses'', $334,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, for necessary expenses to respond to the significant rise in unaccompanied alien children and alien adults accompanied by an alien minor at the Southwest Border of the United States, including for enforcement of immigration and customs law, including detention and removal operations, of which $262,000,000 shall be for Custody Operations and $72,000,000 shall be for Transportation and Removal operations: *Provided*, That not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate an obligation and quarterly expenditure plan for these funds: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall provide to such Committees quarterly updates on the expenditure of these funds.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

SEC. 101. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds provided by this title shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming or transfer of funds that proposes to use funds directed for a specific activity by either of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives or the Senate for a different purpose than for which the appropriations were provided: *Provided*, That prior to the obligation of such funds, a request for approval shall be submitted to such Committees.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide to the Congress quarterly reports that include: (1) the number of apprehensions at the border delineated by unaccompanied alien children and alien adults accompanied by an alien minor; (2) the number of claims of a credible fear of persecution delineated by unaccompanied alien children and alien adults accompanied by an alien minor, and the number of determinations of valid claims of a credible fear of persecution delineated by unaccompanied alien children and alien adults accompanied by an alien minor; (3) the number of unaccompanied alien children and alien adults accompanied by an alien minor granted asylum by an immigration judge, delineated by year of apprehension; (4) the number of alien adults accompanied by an alien minor in detention facilities, alternatives to detention, and other non-detention forms of supervision; and (5) the number of removals delineated by unaccompanied alien children and alien adults accompanied by an alien minor.

SEC. 103. Of the unobligated balance available for ''Department of Homeland Security—Federal Emergency Management Agency—Disaster Relief Fund'', $405,000,000 is rescinded: *Provided*, That no amounts may be rescinded from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to a concurrent resolution on a budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That no amounts may be rescinded from the amounts that were designated by the Congress as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 104. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, grants awarded under sections 2003 or 2004 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 604 and 605) using funds provided under the heading ''Federal Emergency Management Agency—State and Local Programs'' in division F of Public Law 113–76, division D of Public Law 113–6, or division D of Public Law 112–74 may be used by State and local law enforcement and public safety agencies within local units of government along the Southwest Border of the United States for costs incurred during the award period of performance for personnel, overtime, travel, costs related to combating illegal immigration and drug smuggling, and costs related to providing humanitarian relief to unaccompanied alien children and alien adults accompanied by an alien minor who have entered the United States.

SEC. 105. Notwithstanding any other provision in this or any other Act, amounts transferred to the Department of Homeland Security pursuant to section 202 of this Act shall be provided by the Secretary of Homeland Security under the heading ''Federal Emergency Management Agency—State and Local Programs'' to States along the Southwest Border of the United States as reimbursement for necessary costs of National Guard personnel activated under the operational control of the Governors of such States and deployed for the purpose of border security.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

MILITARY PERSONNEL

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''National Guard Personnel, Army'', $47,419,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, for necessary expenses related to the Southwest Border of the United States.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''National Guard Personnel, Air Force'', $2,258,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, for necessary expenses related to the Southwest Border of the United States.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard'', $15,807,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, for necessary expenses related to the Southwest Border of the United States.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard'', $4,516,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, for necessary expenses related to the Southwest Border of the United States.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

(RESCISSION)

SEC. 201. Of the unobligated balances of amounts appropriated in title II of division C of Public Law 113–76 for ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', $70,000,000 is hereby rescinded to reflect excess cash balances in Department of Defense Working Capital Funds.

SEC. 202. Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, of the amounts made available by this Act for ''National Guard Personnel, Army'', the Secretary of Defense shall transfer to the Department of Homeland Security such funds as may be necessary, not to exceed $35,000,000, to reimburse the States for the cost of any units or personnel of the National Guard, to perform operations and missions under State Active Duty status, deployed in support of a southern border mission.

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW AND APPEALS

For an additional amount for ''Administrative Review and Appeals'' for necessary expenses to respond to the significant rise in unaccompanied alien children and alien adults accompanied by an alien minor at the Southwest Border of the United States, $22,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, of which $12,900,000 shall be for additional temporary immigration judges and related expenses, and $9,100,000 shall be for technology for judges to expedite the adjudication of immigration cases.

GENERAL PROVISION—THIS TITLE

(RESCISSION)

SEC. 301. Of the unobligated balances available for ''Department of Justice—Legal Activities—Assets Forfeiture Fund'', $22,000,000 is hereby permanently rescinded.

TITLE IV

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

REPATRIATION AND REINTEGRATION

SEC. 401. (a) REPATRIATION AND REINTEGRATION.—Of the funds appropriated in titles III and IV of division K of Public Law 113–76, and in prior Acts making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs, for assistance for the countries in Central America, up to $40,000,000 shall be made available for such countries for repatriation and reintegration activities: *Provided*, That funds made available pursuant to this section may be obligated notwithstanding subsections (c) and (e) of section 7045 of division K of Public Law 113–76.

(b) REPORT.—Prior to the initial obligation of funds made available pursuant to this section, but not later than 15 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter until September 30, 2015, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the obligation of funds made available pursuant to this section by country and the steps taken by the government of each country to—

(1) improve border security;

(2) enforce laws and policies to stem the flow of illegal entries into the United States;

(3) enact laws and implement new policies to stem the flow of illegal entries into the United States, including increasing penalties for human smuggling;

(4) conduct public outreach campaigns to explain the dangers of the journey to the

Southwest Border of the United States, emphasize the lack of immigration benefits available; and emphasize that illegal aliens will be removed to their country; and

(5) cooperate with United States Federal agencies to facilitate and expedite the return, repatriation, and reintegration of illegal migrants arriving at the Southwest Border of the United States.

(c) SUSPENSION OF ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of State shall suspend assistance provided pursuant to this section to the government of a country if such government is not making significant progress on each item described in paragraphs (1) through (5) of subsection (b): *Provided*, That assistance may only be resumed if the Secretary reports to the appropriate congressional committees that subsequent to the suspension of assistance such government is making significant progress on each of the items enumerated in such subsection.

(d) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—Funds made available pursuant to this section shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(RESCISSION)

SEC. 402. Of the unexpended balances available to the President for bilateral economic assistance under the heading ''Economic Support Fund'' from prior Acts making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs, $197,000,000 is rescinded: *Provided*, That no amounts may be rescinded from amounts that were designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or as an emergency requirement pursuant to a concurrent resolution on the budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

TITLE V

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

REFUGEE AND ENTRANT ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for ''Refugee and Entrant Assistance'', $197,000,000, to be merged with and available for the same time period and for the same purposes as the funds made available under this heading in division H of Public Law 113–76 ''for carrying out such sections 414, 501, 462, and 235'': *Provided*, That of this amount, $47,000,000 shall be for the Social Services and Targeted Assistance programs.

This division may be cited as the ''Secure the Southwest Border Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2014''.

DIVISION B—SECURE THE SOUTHWEST BORDER ACT OF 2014

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This division may be cited as the ''Secure the Southwest Border Act of 2014''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this division is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—PROTECTING CHILDREN

Sec. 101. Repatriation of unaccompanied alien children.
Sec. 102. Last in, first out.
Sec. 103. Emergency immigration judge resources.
Sec. 104. Protecting children from human traffickers, sex offenders, and other criminals.
Sec. 105. Inclusion of additional grounds for per se ineligibility for asylum.

TITLE II—USE OF NATIONAL GUARD TO IMPROVE BORDER SECURITY

Sec. 201. National Guard support for border operations.

TITLE III—NATIONAL SECURITY AND FEDERAL LANDS PROTECTION

Sec. 301. Prohibition on actions that impede border security on certain Federal land.
Sec. 302. Sense of Congress on placement of unauthorized aliens at military installations.
Sec. 303. Limitation on placement of unauthorized aliens at military installations.

TITLE I—PROTECTING CHILDREN

SEC. 101. REPATRIATION OF UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.

Section 235(a) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by amending the paragraph heading to read as follows: ''RULES FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN'';

(B) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''who is a national or habitual resident of a country that is contiguous with the United States'';

(ii) in clause (i), by inserting ''and'' at the end;

(iii) in clause (ii), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period; and

(iv) by striking clause (iii);

(C) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''(''8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) may—'' and inserting ''(8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq)—'';

(ii) in clause (i), by inserting before ''permit such child to withdraw'' the following: ''may''; and

(iii) in clause (ii), by inserting before ''return such child'' the following: ''shall''; and

(D) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by amending the subparagraph heading to read as follows: ''AGREEMENTS WITH FOREIGN COUNTRIES.''; and

(ii) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''The Secretary of State shall negotiate agreements between the United States and countries contiguous to the United States'' and inserting ''The Secretary of State may negotiate agreements between the United States and any foreign country that the Secretary determines appropriate''; and

(2) in paragraph (5)(D)—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i) by striking '', except for an unaccompanied alient child from a contiguous subject to the exceptions under subsection (a)(2),'' and inserting ''who does not meet the criteria listed in paragraph (2)(A)''; and

(B) in clause (i), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: '', which shall include a hearing before an immigration judge not later than 14 days after being screened under paragraph (4) and the unaccompanid alien child shall be detained until such hearing'';.

SEC. 102. LAST IN, FIRST OUT.

In any removal proceedings under section 240 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229a) with respect to an unaccompanied alien child (as defined in section 462(g)(2) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 279(g)(2))), priority shall be accorded to the alien who has most recently arrived in the United States.

SEC. 103. EMERGENCY IMMIGRATION JUDGE RESOURCES.

Not later than 14 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall designate up to 40 immigration judges, including through the hiring of retired immigration judges, administrative law judges, or magistrate judges, or the reassignment of current immigration judges. Such designations shall remain in effect solely for the duration of the humanitarian crisis at the southern border (as determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Attorney General).

SEC. 104. PROTECTING CHILDREN FROM HUMAN TRAFFICKERS, SEX OFFENDERS, AND OTHER CRIMINALS.

Section 235(c)(3) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(c)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by inserting '', including a mandatory biometric criminal history check'' before the period at the end; and

(2) by adding at the end the following—

''(D) PROHIBITION ON PLACEMENT WITH SEX OFFENDERS AND HUMAN TRAFFICKERS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services may not place an unaccompanied alien child in the custody of an individual who has been convicted of—

''(I) a sex offense (as defined in section 111 of the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act (42 U.S.C. 16911)); or

''(II) a crime involving a severe form of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102)).

''(ii) REQUIREMENTS OF CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECK.—A biometric criminal history check under subparagraph (A) shall be based on a set of fingerprints or other biometric identifiers and conducted through—

''(I) the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and

''(II) criminal history repositories of all States that the individual lists as current or former residences.''.

SEC. 105. INCLUSION OF ADDITIONAL GROUNDS FOR PER SE INELIGIBILITY FOR ASYLUM.

Section 208(b)(2)(A)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1158(b)(2)(A)(iii)) is amended by inserting after ''a serious nonpolitical crime'' the following: ''(including any drug-related offense punishable by a term of imprisonment greater than 1 year)''.

TITLE II—USE OF NATIONAL GUARD TO IMPROVE BORDER SECURITY

SEC. 201. NATIONAL GUARD SUPPORT FOR BORDER OPERATIONS.

(a) DEPLOYMENT AUTHORITY AND FUNDING.—Amounts appropriated for the Department of Defense in this Act shall be expended for any units or personnel of the National Guard deployed to perform operations and missions under section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, on the southern border of the United States.

(b) ASSIGNMENT OF OPERATIONS AND MISSIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—National Guard units and personnel deployed under subsection (a) may be assigned such operations as may be necessary to provide assistance for operations on the southern border, with priority given to high traffic areas experiencing the highest number of crossings by unaccompanied alien children.

(2) NATURE OF DUTY.—The duty of National Guard personnel performing operations and missions on the southern border shall be full-time duty under title 32, United States Code.

(c) MATERIEL AND LOGISTICAL SUPPORT.—The Secretary of Defense shall deploy such materiel and equipment and logistical support as may be necessary to ensure success of the operations and missions conducted by the National Guard under this section.

(d) EXCLUSION FROM NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL STRENGTH LIMITATIONS.—National Guard personnel deployed under subsection (a) shall not be included in—

(1) the calculation to determine compliance with limits on end strength for National Guard personnel; or

(2) limits on the number of National Guard personnel that may be placed on active duty

for operational support under section 115 of title 10, United States Code.

(e) HIGH TRAFFIC AREAS DEFINED.—In this section:

(1) The term ''high traffic areas'' means sectors along the northern and southern borders of the United States that are within the responsibility of the Border Patrol that have the most illicit cross-border activity, informed through situational awareness.

(2) The term ''unaccompanied alien child'' means a child who—

(A) has no lawful immigration status in the United States;

(B) has not attained 18 years of age; and

(C) with respect to whom—

(i) there is no parent or legal guardian in the United States; or

(ii) no parent or legal guardian in the United States is available to provide care and physical custody.

TITLE III—NATIONAL SECURITY AND FEDERAL LANDS PROTECTION

SEC. 301. PROHIBITION ON ACTIONS THAT IMPEDE BORDER SECURITY ON CERTAIN FEDERAL LAND.

(a) PROHIBITION ON SECRETARIES OF THE INTERIOR AND AGRICULTURE.—The Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture shall not impede, prohibit, or restrict activities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection on Federal land located within 100 miles of the United States border with Mexico that is under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture, to execute search and rescue operations, and to prevent all unlawful entries into the United States, including entries by terrorists, other unlawful aliens, instruments of terrorism, narcotics, and other contraband through such international land border of the United States. These authorities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection on such Federal land apply whether or not a state of emergency exists.

(b) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES OF U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION.—U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall have immediate access to Federal land within 100 miles of the United States border with Mexico that is under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture for purposes of conducting the following activities on such land that prevent all unlawful entries into the United States, including entries by terrorists, other unlawful aliens, instruments of terrorism, narcotics, and other contraband through such international land border of the United States:

(1) Construction and maintenance of roads.

(2) Construction and maintenance of barriers.

(3) Use of vehicles to patrol, apprehend, or rescue.

(4) Installation, maintenance, and operation of communications and surveillance equipment and sensors.

(5) Deployment of temporary tactical infrastructure.

(c) CLARIFICATION RELATING TO WAIVER AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including any termination date relating to the waiver referred to in this subsection), the waiver by the Secretary of Homeland Security on April 1, 2008, under section 102(c)(1) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1103 note; Public Law 104–208) of the laws described in paragraph (2) with respect to certain sections of the international border between the United States and Mexico shall be considered to apply to all Federal land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture within 100 miles of such international land border of the United States for the activities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection described in subsection (b).

(2) DESCRIPTION OF LAWS WAIVED.—The laws referred to in paragraph (1) are limited to the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.), Public Law 86–523 (16 U.S.C. 469 et seq.), the Act of June 8, 1906 (commonly known as the ''Antiquities Act of 1906''; 16 U.S.C. 431 et seq.), the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1271 et seq.), the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd et seq.), the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (16 U.S.C. 742a et seq.), the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.), subchapter II of chapter 5, and chapter 7, of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Administrative Procedure Act''), the National Park Service Organic Act (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), the General Authorities Act of 1970 (Public Law 91–383) (16 U.S.C. 1a–1 et seq.), sections 401(7), 403, and 404 of the National Parks and Recreation Act of 1978 (Public Law 95–625, 92 Stat. 3467), and the Arizona Desert Wilderness Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 101–628).

(d) PROTECTION OF LEGAL USES.—This section shall not be construed to provide—

(1) authority to restrict legal uses, such as grazing, hunting, mining, or public-use recreational and backcountry airstrips on land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture; or

(2) any additional authority to restrict legal access to such land.

(e) EFFECT ON STATE AND PRIVATE LAND.—This Act shall—

(1) have no force or effect on State or private lands; and

(2) not provide authority on or access to State or private lands.

(f) TRIBAL SOVEREIGNTY.—Nothing in this section supersedes, replaces, negates, or diminishes treaties or other agreements between the United States and Indian tribes.

SEC. 302. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PLACEMENT OF UNAUTHORIZED ALIENS AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Secretary of Defense should not allow the placement of unauthorized aliens at a military installation unless—

(A) the Secretary submits written notice to the congressional defense committees and each Member of Congress representing any jurisdiction in which an affected military installation is situated; and

(B) the Secretary publishes notice in the Federal Register;

(2) the placement of unauthorized aliens at a military institution should not displace active members of the Armed Forces;

(3) the placement of unauthorized aliens at a military institution should not interfere with any mission of the Department of Defense;

(4) the Secretary of Health and Human Services should not use a military installation for the placement of unauthorized aliens unless all other facilities of the Department of Health and Human Services are unavailable;

(5) the Secretary of Health and Human Services should not use a military installation for the placement of unauthorized aliens for more than 120 days;

(6) the Secretary of Health and Human Services should ensure that all unauthorized alien children are vaccinated upon arrival at a military installation as set forth in the guidelines of the Office of Refugee Resettlement;

(7) the Secretary of Health and Human Services should ensure that all individuals under the supervision of the Secretary with access to unauthorized alien children at a military installation are properly cleared according to the procedures set forth in the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13001 et seq.);

(8) the Secretary of Health and Human Services should fully comply with the provisions of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13001 et seq.) with respect to background checks and should retain full legal responsibility for such compliance; and

(9) in accordance with section 1535 of title 31, United States Code (commonly referred to as the ''Economy Act''), the Secretary of Health and Human Services should reimburse the Secretary of Defense for all expenses incurred by the Secretary of Defense in carrying out the placement of unauthorized aliens at a military installation.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''congressional defense committees'' has the meaning given that term in section 101(a)(16) of title 10, United States Code.

(2) The term ''Member of Congress'' has the meaning given that term in section 1591(c)(1) of title 10, United States Code.

(3) The term ''military installation'' has the meaning given that term in section 2801(c)(4) of title 10, United States Code, but does not include an installation located outside of the United States.

(4) The term ''placement'' means the placement of an unauthorized alien in either a detention facility or an alternative to such a facility.

(5) The term ''unauthorized alien'' means an alien unlawfully present in the United States, but does not include a dependent of a member of the Armed Forces.

SEC. 303. LIMITATION SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PLACEMENT OF UNAUTHORIZED ALIENS AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.

(a) LIMITATION.—The Secretary of Defense may not allow the placement of unauthorized aliens at a military installation in the United States if the use of the military institution to house or care for unauthorized aliens would—

(1) displace members of the Armed Forces serving on active duty or in a reserve or Guard status; or

(2) interfere with activities of the Armed Forces, including reserve components thereof, at the installation.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''military installation'' has the meaning given such term in section 2801(c)(4) of title 10, United States Code.

(2) The term ''unauthorized alien'' means an alien unlawfully present in the United States, but does not include a dependent of a member of the Armed Forces.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for an additional hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative

days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 5230, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to continue the debate on H.R. 5230, with further amendments added by the rule the House just adopted. The need to pass this bill before Congress leaves for the August break is just as critical today as it was yesterday.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, provides funding to meet immediate border security and humanitarian needs in response to the recent surge of illegal immigrants crossing our southern border.

In terms of funding, this bill is essentially the same as the legislation the House considered yesterday. It emphasizes securing our borders, providing humanitarian assistance for unaccompanied children in U.S. custody, and preventing further influxes of illegal immigration, both by funding vital programs and by implementing important policy provisions. This is also a fiscally responsible bill. All funding is offset, so it won't add a penny to our deficit.

However, the bill differs from the version yesterday by adding an additional $35 million for the National Guard to allow States, including Texas, to be reimbursed for National Guard activities related to border security and the current influx of illegal immigrants. This brings the new total of the bill to $694 million, and, again, it is fully offset.

In addition, the bill includes new tweaks to various policy provisions which will help to further tighten our borders and provide solutions that help solve our immigration challenges for the future.

Mr. Speaker, we have a crisis on our hands, and we can't simply get up and walk away. It is our moral responsibility to protect our homeland and to properly care for and process the thousands of unaccompanied children who put their lives in the hands of criminals to cross our borders. We simply can't turn our backs on this. We must pass this bill today, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

SECURE THE SOUTHWEST BORDER SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014 (DIVISION A of H.R. 5230)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Request	Recommended in the Bill	Bill vs. Request
DIVISION A -- SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS			
TITLE I			
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY			
U.S. Customs and Border Protection			
Salaries and Expenses (emergency)	393,549	---	-393,549
Salaries and Expenses	---	71,000	+71,000
Air and Marine Interdiction, Operations, Maintenance, and Procurement (emergency)	39,411	---	-39,411
Total, U.S. Customs and Border Protection	432,960	71,000	-361,960
U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement			
Salaries and Expenses (emergency)	1,103,995	---	-1,103,995
Salaries and Expenses	---	334,000	+334,000
GENERAL PROVISIONS -- THIS TITLE			
FEMA Disaster Relief Fund (Sec. 103) (rescission)	---	-405,000	-405,000
Total, title I	1,536,955	---	-1,536,955
TITLE II			
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE -- MILITARY			
Military Personnel			
National Guard Personnel, Army	---	47,419	+47,419
National Guard Personnel, Air Force	---	2,258	+2,258
Total, Military Personnel	---	49,677	+49,677
Operation and Maintenance			
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	---	15,807	+15,807
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	---	4,516	+4,516
Total, Operation and Maintenance	---	20,323	+20,323
GENERAL PROVISION -- THIS TITLE			
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide (Sec. 201) (rescission)	---	-70,000	-70,000
Total, title II	---	---	---
TITLE III			
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE			
General Administration			
Administrative Review and Appeals (emergency)	62,900	---	-62,900
Administrative Review and Appeals	---	22,000	+22,000

SECURE THE SOUTHWEST BORDER SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014 (DIVISION A of H.R. 5230)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Request	Recommended in the Bill	Bill vs. Request
Legal Activities			
Salaries and Expenses, General Legal Activities (emergency)	1,100	---	-1,100
GENERAL PROVISION -- THIS TITLE			
DOJ Assets Forfeiture Fund (Sec. 301) (rescission)	---	-22,000	-22,000
Total, title III	64,000	---	-64,000
TITLE IV			
DEPARTMENT OF STATE			
Administration of Foreign Affairs			
Diplomatic and Consular Programs (emergency)	5,000	---	-5,000
BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE			
Funds Appropriated to the President			
Economic Support Fund (emergency)	295,000	---	-295,000
GENERAL PROVISION -- THIS TITLE			
Repatriation and reintegration (Sec. 401) (non-add)	---	(40,000)	(+40,000)
Economic Support Fund (Sec. 402) (rescission)	---	-197,000	-197,000
Total, title IV	300,000	-197,000	-497,000
TITLE V			
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES			
Administration for Children and Families			
Refugee and Entrant Assistance (emergency)	1,830,000	---	-1,830,000
Refugee and Entrant Assistance	---	197,000	+197,000
Total, title V	1,830,000	197,000	-1,633,000
GENERAL PROVISION -- THIS ACT			
Transfer authority (emergency)	(250,000)	---	(-250,000)
GRAND TOTAL	3,730,955	---	-3,730,955
Appropriations	---	(694,000)	(+694,000)
Emergencies	(3,730,955)	---	(-3,730,955)
Rescissions	---	(-694,000)	(-694,000)

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise today to oppose this outrageous bill and the ridiculous process that produced it.

Just yesterday, this House attempted to consider a bill that went too far on policy and not far enough on funding levels, but apparently even that wasn't bad enough for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

□ 1915

Mr. Speaker, yesterday's bill vanished into thin air, and in its place, we now have this haphazard mess. This bill is the result of some sort of auction with members of the majority.

The bill also paves the way for another piece of legislation to be approved tonight—a brand-new bill on the so-called DACA—deferred action on undocumented children program—related to young people who were brought here as minors by 2007 and only know the United States of America as their home. This new bill has not been approved by any committee and contains language that would throw thousands of young people into legal limbo.

This new supplemental funding bill would add an additional $35 million to reimburse States for deploying the National Guard to the border, which is pointless. In other words, U.S. taxpayers will pick up the tab for Governor Perry's campaign stunt.

The bill also would change the initial screening process used by Customs and Border Patrol. The U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops opposes the change, noting:

> It would make crippling changes to current U.S.-trafficking victim protection law that we fear would send these vulnerable children, and others in the future who have fled trauma, exploitation, and violence, back into harm's way, likely resulting in continued degradation, injury, and death for many of them.

I insert the letter into the RECORD.

U.S. CONFERENCE OF
CATHOLIC BISHOPS,
COMMITTEE ON MIGRATION,
Washington, DC, August 1, 2014.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I write to reaffirm the opposition of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) to H.R. 5230 and express our opposition to H.R. 5232.

Our opposition to H.R. 5230 stems from four troubling aspects of the measure. First, it would make crippling changes to current U.S. trafficking victim protection law that we fear would send these vulnerable children, and others in the future who have fled trauma, exploitation, and violence, back into harm's way, likely resulting in continued degradation, injury, and death for many of them. Second, it would not provide adequate funding for the Department of Health and Human Services Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) to enable it to care for vulnerable unaccompanied children in U.S. custody. Third, its level of funding for ORR is so low that it would severely hamper the agency's ability to fulfill its responsibility to care for refugees, asylum seekers, special immigrants, trafficking victims, and torture victims. And fourth, the measure contains no provisions to address the root causes that have compelled so many children to make the arduous journey from their homes in Central America to the United States and elsewhere in the region.

Our opposition to H.R. 5232 stems from its elimination of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program. It is our view that this program has helped protect a vulnerable group of children who for all extensive purposes are Americans. It would subject them once again to removal to countries they do not know. We urge its defeat.

How our nation responds to this humanitarian challenge is a moral test of our national character. We ask that you oppose H.R. 5230 and H.R. 5232, which we feel fail to live up to that test.

Sincerely,

MOST REVEREND EUSEBIO ELIZONDO,
Auxiliary Bishop of Seattle, WA,
Chairman, USCCB Committee on Migration.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, this House majority needs to make up its collective mind. Do they want to provide emergency funding to enable our Federal agencies to respond to the humanitarian crisis on the border? Or do they wish to rewrite current law on immigration, political asylum, and due process? We can't do both in an hour of floor consideration.

The House should have already taken up bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform the Senate passed more than 1 year ago, with the support of Democrats and Republicans, the labor and business communities, evangelicals, law enforcement, and many others.

We would have been proud to work together with our Republicans on the other side of the aisle to give thoughtful consideration to this immigration process. The Senate did it. We had an opportunity to do it, and instead, we are rushing through tonight to put a bill on the floor that has changed many times as it has proceeded through the process.

That bill, the comprehensive immigration bill, would have helped prevent the crisis on the border today. If we had passed this 1 year ago, we wouldn't be in the desperate situation we are in now. Now, we are at a point where it requires emergency supplemental funding that we should provide cleanly and quickly without the baggage of extraneous policy that caused so much political division.

This package crossed the line from being a supplemental spending bill and became a controversial revision of immigration policy with limited funding thrown in as an afterthought. That is a shame. That is really sad because we know that the Departments of Homeland Security, Justice, Health and Human Services, and State need this money to do the job.

Mr. Speaker, just last year, this body allowed a small vocal minority to push a government shutdown over controversial policy ideas. This process today causes me to wonder whether many have learned the perils of such recklessness.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this package and start over. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, we are here with this crisis because the President announced a policy that no one would be deported unless they were a criminal. That word spread through our Central American countries, and families said: hey, the gates are open; while this President is in office, if you go there and you get in, then you won't be deported.

The administration knew this 2 years ago. The word came out that we were being flooded, increasingly so, from Central American countries. So we are here trying to fix the problem that is an emergency caused by this administration, and the administration's control of the other body, rather than help us solve the problem, left town at noon today without doing anything. So we are trying to clean up their mess and the administration's mess, and this bill will do that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Mrs. GRANGER), the chair of the Speaker's task force on border security and the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations.

Mrs. GRANGER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for the hard work you have put into this difficult situation.

Mr. Speaker, we are here tonight because this Congress has a responsibility to immediately stop the humanitarian crisis on our southern border. The President has failed to lead. The Senate failed to lead. This Chamber has to lead.

Since October, 58,000 unaccompanied minors have made the treacherous 1,000-mile journey from Central America, across Mexico, and through our southern border. Tens of thousands more unaccompanied minors are expected to come if we don't act. Doing nothing is not an option. I repeat, doing nothing is not an option.

The members of the working group I chaired made recommendations for an immediate short-term response. I want to recognize the hard work and commitment of the working group members who made targeted policy recommendations on how to end this crisis.

Our conclusions included in the bill are to tweak the 2008 Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act to make sure that all unaccompanied minors are treated the same as Mexicans, prioritize last in-first out, expedite the hearing process within 7 days after the children are detained, and hire additional temporary judges to support the accelerated process.

To fully support Customs and Border Protection's mission, we include a provision to allow Border Patrol unfettered access to Federal lands. Finally, Mr. Speaker, the supplemental includes a sense of Congress that children should not be detained at military bases.

The Congressional Budget Office has given its assessment of the policy changes in this legislation. They have

said that because the legislation allows for the children to self-deport, it will lead to immediate savings.

I want to commend Chairman ROGERS on this smart, targeted bill that helps address the crisis immediately, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the supplemental.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GALLEGO).

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, if you read what reporters are already saying, they are saying that this isn't a serious bill that will ever become law—that opportunity was lost yesterday when the original bill was pulled. They are saying this bill does nothing because it isn't going anywhere once it leaves the House.

The perception of the press and the American people is that this is all political theater. Why don't we prove them wrong? Why don't we cancel our travel plans and commit to staying here until we can agree on an actual solution to this border issue that we can put into a bill that might actually have a shot of becoming law?

Any single one of us who is married knows the importance of compromise. Imagine what happens if you walk in your house every day and you tell your spouse: I really don't care what you think today, I am not interested in your opinion, we are going to do it my way.

Well, that marriage wouldn't last very long. Anyone who is in a marriage knows the importance of compromise and knows what happens when a relationship is one-sided.

We can get together on this. We did it for the VA; we can, and we should do it for this. An opportunity to sit down around the same table and negotiate our way through in a very serious and in a very real way—without the rhetoric, just simple reason, simple common sense—that makes a difference every day for the people on our border. That is what I would ask, and that is what I think the American people are asking.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the newly elected majority whip of the U.S. House.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, for his leadership, and the gentlewoman from Texas for her leadership in putting this working group together to bring a bill to address this crisis.

Mr. Speaker, there is a crisis at our border. The President has refused and failed to do his job to address the crisis. The Senate in fact today failed to do their job and left town without passing anything to address this crisis, but the House is here working.

The people's House is here working, and we are not going to stop working until we get our job done and pass legislation that actually addresses this crisis, and that is what this bill does, Mr. Speaker.

We have got a bill that actually allows the Governors along the border to call up the National Guard to help secure the border. The President ought to do this job. The President has all the tools to secure the border, but he won't. He has failed to do one of his basic functions in securing the American border.

Shouldn't the Governors along that border be able to call up the National Guard to help secure it if the President won't? Not only do we do that, Mr. Speaker, but we put the funds in place to ensure that it gets done.

Some other things we do is end this catch-and-release program that has been a magnet for thousands of people to come across the border and be released throughout the country—some never to be seen again. We can stop this, and we do in our bill.

Mr. Speaker, this is important legislation that actually sends a strong message that we are going to take this issue seriously, and we are going to actually solve this crisis. If the Senate wants to be serious about doing their job and if the President wants to be serious about doing his job, they ought to come back here and pass something of their own, but they won't, but that is no reason to fail to lead. That is why the House is leading.

We are going to pass this bill, and we are going to propose a solution to this crisis. I encourage the Senate to come back and do their job, and I encourage the President to start doing his.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the ranking member of the Immigration Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, we have heard repeatedly that this bill simply treats all children the way that Mexican children are treated. It is true that the bill would subject all children to the ineffective border screening that Mexican children now undergo, but it actually makes that screening much worse.

Under the antislavery law, Mexican children are permitted to withdraw their applications for admission and return to Mexico only if the Border Patrol screener determines that the child has the capacity to understand what is going on and can independently agree to withdraw the application for admission.

This bill strikes that language. Under this bill, it does not matter whether the child can comprehend that she has been given the option to voluntarily return to her home country because, in this bill, it does not matter what she thinks.

This bill now says that while a child may be permitted to withdraw her application for admission, no matter what, she shall be returned—no matter what, once Border Patrol decides, that is the end of the discussion, and that kid is going home.

Now, this is not just about our southern border and children from Central America. This new procedure would apply to any unaccompanied minor child who appears at our border seeking asylum.

□ 1930

It could mean that the pregnant Chinese teenager fleeing forced abortion in China simply gets turned away. It could mean that Syrian Christian children fleeing horrific violence and persecution in Syria simply get turned away. It would turn aside a child from Thailand being trafficked for sex.

I don't know that this was necessarily the intention of this bill—I would certainly hope not—but that is the way the bill is written. That is the effect it would have, and I think it is simply unconscionable.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee for his leadership on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5230.

There is a crisis at our southern border, and it is a disaster of President Obama's own making. The Obama administration's lax immigration enforcement policies have given confidence to parents who are in the U.S. illegally that they can stay, and now they are finding ways to bring their children who are still in Central America and beyond to the United States unlawfully. Although President Obama has many tools at his disposal to stop this surge at the border, he refuses to use them and instead proposes to make the situation worse by taking more unilateral actions to stop the enforcement of our immigration laws.

It is ultimately up to President Obama to end this crisis by reversing his policies that created it. However, since he refuses to do so, we have to act to the extent we can to provide narrow and targeted funding to meet the immediate needs of our law enforcement agencies at the southern border. We have to enable them to do their job to secure our border and enforce our immigration laws.

And we need to tweak the 2008 law regarding the removal of unaccompanied alien minors. We need to treat apprehended minors from Central America in the same expedited but humane fashion that we treat apprehended minors from Mexico and Canada. In fact, the administration has called for such a change.

On July 14, before the Senate Appropriations Committee, DHS Secretary Jeh Johnson said that the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 needed to be amended. He said:

> In terms of changing the law, we are asking for the ability to treat unaccompanied

kids from a Central American country in the same way as from a contiguous country.

That is what this bill does, based on language written by Representative CARTER, and it makes the important clarification that all minors from any country who do not have a credible fear of persecution and have not been trafficked shall be expeditiously returned home.

Because of the President's inaction, we are taking the responsible step today of passing these narrow fixes that will help the American people avoid billions of dollars in additional costs due to the President not trying to solve this problem but asking for more money to continue to resettle tens of thousands of people into the interior of our country.

While the bill is not perfect, it does give law enforcement many tools they have requested. For example, while I was in the Rio Grande Valley earlier this month, Border Patrol agents cited administration-created restrictions that bar them access to Federal lands as a significant stumbling block to securing the border. One of the more important provisions of this bill gives Border Patrol agents access to Federal lands so that they can stop drug traffickers, human smugglers, and unlawful immigrants from exploiting these gaps along the border.

Since the President isn't taking the serious action needed to address the crisis at the border, the House is doing so today. Again, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished minority whip of the House.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, House Republicans have taken two bad bills that failed to meet the challenge of the humanitarian crisis on the border and made them worse. They are worse for children. They are worse for women. And they are worse for those who were brought here as children, grew up here, and know no other home than America. These bills do not reflect America's values and our highest ideals.

The bills that were put forward yesterday had no chance of seeing action in the Senate. Neither do these. In fact, Representative JOHN FLEMING is reported to have said that the supplemental bill is ''political cover'' and that ''not a single Republican in the House believes it'll be signed into law.''

I believe that statement to be absolutely accurate.

Chairwoman GRANGER, my friend with whom I served on the Appropriations Committee, said, just a few minutes ago, doing nothing is not an option. And I very politely suggest to her what we are doing tonight is nothing.

What we do tonight will not pass, will not solve a problem, will not change policy, and it will not give the needed resources that are necessary. Republicans have once again embraced their ''my way or the highway'' attitude, the same attitude that led to last year's shutdown, instead of reaching across the aisle and working with Democrats on bipartisan legislation that can address this crisis and be enacted.

We are debating a bill that is not only bad in substance, but that was brought to the floor in near secrecy in violation of the Republican majority's own 3-day rule. How ironic. How ironic that Majority Leader MCCARTHY said in an op-ed in the Washington Post today:

> I will commit to the committee process and regular order.

This is neither the committee process nor regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the House action tonight does not reflect those words from this morning's op-ed.

Mr. Speaker, we ought to have a responsible, bipartisan measure to provide the needed funds to address the border crisis, but we also must see this as a reminder of why we must pass comprehensive immigration reform.

Speaker BOEHNER, himself, said the House would act, saying last May:

> The House remains committed to fixing our broken immigration system.

This is not a fix. But tonight, we must address the crisis before us. Our Republican friends should work with Democrats on a solution that can pass the House—this probably can—pass the Senate—this cannot—and be signed by the President. Nobody here, as Congressman FLEMING indicated, believes that will be the case.

Tonight will be a loss for rational humanitarian action and a victory for partisan, negative policy. How sad. How wrong. How disappointing to the American people.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume to say at least the House is putting a bill on the floor and passing it, which solves the problem. If we had the Senate here to work with us, we might be able to get a bill the President could sign. But the Senate is gone. They have left. So I would hope that the leader of the Senate would recognize that his body is getting severely criticized for leaving town without offering a solution to this crisis on our border.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER), who chairs the Appropriations Homeland Security Subcommittee.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security and as a native Texan, I am uniquely familiar with our southern border. I am also uniquely familiar with the national security crisis and law enforcement nightmare erupting on that border, primarily in my State of Texas.

Mr. Speaker, as I have often said, and said yesterday, lawlessness breeds lawlessness. The crisis unfolding on our border is in very large part a result of the President's political decision to not enforce the immigration laws of this Nation. The House intends to correct that tonight.

In many ways this bill is similar to the legislation the House considered yesterday, but it has some important improvements. Once again, the funding in this package is fully offset and provides the resources needed to address the immediate crisis. This bill also includes the necessary policy changes to bring parity to the adjudication and repatriation of these children. Many of these provisions are borrowed from a bill I drafted along with ROBERT ADERHOLT and JACK KINGSTON, H.R. 5143, the Protection of Children Act.

This bill expands the tools available to our Border Patrol agents and allows them to better and more quickly screen the influx of migrant children. It ensures a timely trial so that no child will have to wait in limbo for months or years to find out whether or not they will be able to stay in the United States. It includes crucial language to prevent these children from being placed with criminals, sex offenders, or human traffickers. And finally, this bill provides additional resources for our border Governors as they work to assist Federal officials and keep our citizens safe.

I urge my colleagues to join me and others in supporting this strong bill. Lawlessness has bred this lawlessness. We must stop it and secure our border.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to remind the distinguished chair of the Appropriations Committee that the reason the Senate could not bring a bill to the floor was because not one Republican will allow the procedural vote of cloture to bring it to the floor. Therefore, we are having a very important debate, but this bill, as you know, is going nowhere.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), the ranking member of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this so-called appropriations bill. I say ''so-called'' because it really is mainly about ill-advised and mean-spirited policy changes. Rather than providing the necessary funds to deal with the humanitarian crisis at the border, this bill mainly reduces protections for young people facing violence that we can hardly imagine.

For awhile, it looked like we might do better than this. As the ranking member of the Appropriations Homeland Security Subcommittee, I was pleased to take part in a recent delegation to Central America ably led by Chairwoman KAY GRANGER. But as successive versions of the Republican bill have surfaced over the past 2 weeks, in

a quest for votes only among Republicans, they reflected less and less of what we learned on that trip. That was true when I said it yesterday, and it is even more true of the bill before us now.

By the way, to respond to a claim we have heard tonight: Not a person we talked to any time, anywhere blamed the surge in unaccompanied minors on the President's decision to prioritize the deportation of dangerous criminals. That is just not a credible proposition.

The bill under consideration provides less than $1 billion to the Departments of Homeland Security, Health and Human Services, Justice, and State, far below what is required to deal with this crisis. And what of the money that is in the bill? Most of it reflects a fundamental misunderstanding of the issue before us. This isn't a border security crisis; it is a humanitarian crisis. We don't need to deploy the National Guard or surge our border capacity, because we are not failing to catch individuals as they cross. In fact, these young people are turning themselves in!

This new, worse bill brought before us mere hours ago would entice Texas, and potentially other border States, with Federal dollars, to use the National Guard to militarize the southern border. At the same time, it underfunds the additional judges that I thought we agreed were needed. We all know that we need to deal with the claims put forward by these young people who present themselves.

So, Mr. Speaker, let's pass an appropriations bill that reflects our country's values and actually addresses the problems we face. Let's also face up to our responsibility to pass comprehensive immigration reform, as the Senate did a year ago. This bill moves us in exactly the wrong direction. I urge its rejection.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON), the distinguished chairman of the Military Construction-VA Appropriations Subcommittee.

□ 1945

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have heard several of my Democratic colleagues tonight say this bill does not reflect American values. I am disappointed to hear them say that because it really reflects a fundamental, probably one of the most fundamental differences between our two parties, as we on our side as Republicans believe in the most important American value and that is enforcement. The first design on the first coin minted in the Republic of Mexico after the Revolution said: Liberty in the Law. We all understand as lawmakers, as Americans, that there can be no liberty without law enforcement.

The bill before us tonight is very simple, this is not complicated. This is a law enforcement issue. This is a law enforcement bill. Without respect for the law there can be no liberty, without respect for the law there can be no peace and quiet, there can be no prosperity.

My good friend HENRY CUELLAR, who represents the city of Laredo, whom I served with in the Texas legislature, understands better than most that, because Laredo is the largest inland port in the United States, his constituents need law and order in order to be prosperous, to be able to trade with Mexico, our most important trading partner. That relationship with Mexico is essential to the Texas economy, to the United States economy, and for that relationship to thrive there must be law and order, there must be respect for the law, and there must be peace and quiet on the streets of Laredo so children can play in the streets, so people don't have to worry about whether or not they can send their kids down to the corner store, whether or not they can thrive in the future. It is a tragedy what has happened in Nuevo Laredo. One of the most beautiful cities on the border is now essentially a ghost town because there is no respect for the law.

The bill before us tonight that the Republican majority has put together reflects our core value as Americans to respect the law, to enforce the law, with a kind heart and commonsense. We believe in the good judgment of our law enforcement officers and our National Guardsmen to use their good hearts and their commonsense as Americans to distinguish between the widow and her child who is escaping a terrible situation at home. We are trusting the good hearts and good sense of our immigration officers to know the difference between a tattooed criminal and a drug dealer and a smuggler, and the child who has come here innocently, brought up in the trust the President of the United States has made inviting them all up here. It is a tragedy for them, it is a tragedy for our border communities, it is a tragedy for the country to let these folks come into the country.

This is a law enforcement issue, it is a law enforcement bill. I encourage folks to vote ''yes.''

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am proud to be a Member of the Congress of the United States of America because I have respect for the law. The comprehensive immigration bill has been sitting out there for over a year. If we could work in a bipartisan way, if we could show that we have respect for the law, we would have had a serious debate and really passed a law. This bill is going nowhere. As you know, the Republicans in the Senate wouldn't even bring a bill to the floor.

That is why I am proud to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

The corrosive effects of shutdown do-nothing politics is on full display here tonight in the House of Representatives. Stripping the rights and protections of children is never a good solution in any legislation, whether it is the children huddled at the border alone and afraid or now including the young DREAMers of America who believe in this country. They have now become the targets of this legislation. They are the ones who are being told, it is because of you that we must change the law and treat human beings so harshly.

Mr. Speaker, if I could speak to those frightened children and our DREAMers of America and those working for a fair solution on their behalf, this is what I would say:

(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows:)

Is there any doubt what Republicans' intentions are for the migrant children at the border?

Is there any doubt what Republicans' intentions are for young DREAMers and their families?

Is there any doubt why immigration reform remains shackled?

Is there any doubt what we must do with our vote, our voice, to defend the rights and dreams of our children?

¿Queda duda de las intenciones republicanas hacia los niños migrantes en la frontera?

¿Queda duda de las intenciones republicanas hacia los muchachos soñadores y sus familias?

¿Queda duda de porqué la reforma migratoria queda encadenada?

¿Queda duda de lo que tenemos que hacer con nuestro voto, nuestra voz, para defender los derechos y los sueños de nuestros hijos?

Mr. BECERRA. Tonight, with this bill, we see what happens when, for more than 390 days, our Republican colleagues refused to allow a vote on the Senate's bipartisan solution to a broken immigration system. But for the shutdown do-nothing politics in this House, we could have tackled the humanitarian issues we face down on the border a year ago, but we haven't been able to get a vote to do this the right way.

It is time to have that vote to fix the broken immigration system, not blame children and punish them by changing the law to strip them of their rights and of their protections.

We can do better. This bill will not become law, and we will have a chance to do better for those children, for those DREAMers, and, quite honestly, for America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California will provide a translation of his statement for the RECORD.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 14½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, this border crisis is one of the President's making.

We are here on a Friday night in August because the President has not done his job. His failure to enforce the law and failure to secure the border have encouraged tens of thousands of children to make a dangerous journey to the United States. On the way, they are exposed to traffickers, health risks, and other dangers. That is not fair to these children. This is just the latest example of the President's lack of regard for the rule of law and how it has very real consequences.

This legislation before the House addresses the crisis with solutions that prioritize resources to expedite the processing of cases, provide temporary housing and humanitarian assistance, return children to their countries of origin, and deploy the National Guard.

Importantly, it will prevent future humanitarian crises by amending current law to allow children to be promptly returned to their native home.

This legislation is not a blank check for the President. It is a carefully crafted response to the chaos that the President has allowed to develop on the border and in these children's lives.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a member of the Labor, Health and Human Services and Foreign Operations Subcommittees of Appropriations.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, let me thank our ranking member, Mrs. LOWEY, for yielding and for her tremendous leadership.

Let me just start by saying that, yes, as an appropriator, I am very troubled by the shameful, first of all, inadequate funding levels and the dangerous policy riders in this bill.

Let's be honest: the bill before us in no way is a genuine effort to address the humanitarian crisis on our borders. We should be trying to help these children by making sure that they are safe and receiving due process, rather than militarizing our southern border.

Instead, this bill strips protections for children and accelerates deportations of children back to nations with some of the highest rates of deadly violence on the planet.

According to a report by the United Nation's High Commissioner for Refugees, nearly 60 percent of affected children would qualify for international protections and stated that they were fleeing violence.

This bill is shameful and does not reflect our country's proud legacy as a Nation of immigrants. We should be debating real proposals like comprehensive immigration reform that could really improve the lives of people and the American economy. We could pass it today. Instead, we are here playing politics with the lives of children.

This bill flies in the face of our values and does nothing, once again, to address due process for these children. This was a terrible bill yesterday; it is worse tonight. It will not become law, thank goodness. Hopefully, all of us will vote ''no'' and come back and begin to look at how we really address the needs of these children. They need our help desperately.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER).

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, how did a $35 million earmark for 2012 and maybe 2016 Republican Presidential candidate Texas Governor Rick Perry get into this bill and why? If Texas Governor Rick Perry chooses to send the Texas National Guard to the Texas border on his own, not as a national decision or response, that is his right, but he should pay for it. It is wrong to tax New Hampshire taxpayers and taxpayers around the country to pay for a $35 million earmark for a Texas Governor who acted on his own and now should pay for his decision.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the minority leader of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

The time is late, the cause is great. We must, we must have clarity in how we understand what is before us.

Today, we had an opportunity to work together to address humanitarian emergency at the border. Instead, it is a day of missed opportunity. The Republican leadership has rejected our hand of friendship to compromise on this supplemental. Instead of bringing legislation forward that could solve this problem really and truly, it has resisted the appeals of humanitarian and religious leaders across all faiths.

The Evangelical Immigration Table calls on us to ensure that our response strengthens our country's tradition of providing safety and refuge to the vulnerable.

This legislation that we have before us does not do that. It is wrong. But don't take my word for it. The U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops urges Members to oppose H.R. 5230 and work together to craft legislation that is more befitting the United States of America and the American people's history of compassion and generosity to vulnerable children and refugees.

The Archbishop of Miami, Thomas Wenski, speaking on their behalf, has said of this legislation, the two pieces of legislation before us:

> This is a sad day for our country. A Chamber of Congress is poised to send vulnerable children back to danger and possible death. It violates our commitment to human rights and due process of the law, and lessens us as a Nation.

In their letter, the bishops further state their opposition to H.R. 5232 and say that it ''stems from its elimination of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program,'' otherwise known as DACA.

In conclusion, the bishops write:

> How our Nation responds to this humanitarian challenge is a moral test of our national character. We ask that you oppose H.R. 5230 and H.R. 5272, which we feel fail to live up to that test.

Others, such as the American Bar Association, write:

> Due to their age, lack of education, language, and cultural barriers, and the complexity of U.S. immigration law, these vulnerable children face insurmountable obstacles to proving their claims before an immigration judge on their own.
>
> It is the children who are most likely to be eligible for some relief under the law who may be least able to articulate their experiences under this proposed procedure.

They have been through a lot of trauma, and we want to add to that. Yet, this has not been enough to stem the path that the House Republicans are going down. To further poison the pie they offer their caucus the chance to even be less compassionate in their vote to end DACA and to deport the DREAMers.

It is not enough for Republicans to send desperate children back to the violence of their home countries. They must also vote to deport the best young immigrants and brightest in our schools, vote to send victims of domestic violence back to their abusers, vote to hand witnesses back to drug lords, vote to remove the parents of American children.

These pieces of legislation dishonor America. They are a rejection of our values. But don't take it from me, take it from the bishops, the Evangelical Table, and others. They run counter to the respect for the spark of divinity that we believe exists in every person, the respect for the dignity and worth of every person that we share, but these pieces of legislation ignore.

□ 2000

House Republicans have truly lost their way. I certainly hope that you will consider rereading the parable of the Good Samaritan who helped a stranger. He did not ignore or harm a stranger he saw on the road. Perhaps that may be a path back for you. I pray that it is so.

Mr. Speaker, I will submit for the record letters from the bishops, the Evangelical Immigration Table, and the ABA who oppose these pieces of legislation.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

COMMITTEE ON MIGRATION,
Washington, DC, August 1, 2014.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I write to reaffirm the opposition of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) to H.R. 5230 and express our opposition to H.R. 5232.

Our opposition to H.R. 5230 stems from four troubling aspects of the measure. First, it would make crippling changes to current U.S. trafficking victim protection law that we fear would send these vulnerable children, and others in the future who have fled trauma, exploitation, and violence, back into

harm's way, likely resulting in continued degradation, injury, and death for many of them. Second, it would not provide adequate funding for the Department of Health and Human Services Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) to enable it to care for vulnerable unaccompanied children in U.S. custody. Third, its level of funding for ORR is so low that it would severely hamper the agency's ability to fulfill its responsibility to care for refugees, asylum seekers, special immigrants, trafficking victims, and torture victims. And fourth, the measure contains no provisions to address the root causes that have compelled so many children to make the arduous journey from their homes in Central America to the United States and elsewhere in the region.

Our opposition to H.R. 5232 stems from its elimination of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program. It is our view that this program has helped protect a vulnerable group of children who for all extensive purposes are Americans. It would subject them once again to removal to countries they do not know. We urge its defeat.

How our nation responds to this humanitarian challenge is a moral test of our national character. We ask that you oppose H.R. 5230 and H.R. 5232, which we feel fail to live up to that test.

Sincerely,

MOST REVEREND EUSEBIO ELIZONDO,
Auxiliary Bishop of Seattle, WA,
Chairman, USCCB Committee on Migration.

COMMITTEE ON MIGRATION,
Washington, DC, July 30, 2014.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I write on behalf of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) to express the bishops' opposition to H.R. 5230, a measure making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014 and making a number of changes to U.S. immigration and human trafficking law. We strongly urge Members to vote AGAINST H.R. 5230 when it is brought before the full House of Representatives and that the House, instead, work with the Senate to craft legislation that is more befitting the United States' and the American people's history of compassion for and generosity to vulnerable children and refugees.

Our opposition to H.R. 5230 stems from four troubling aspects of the measure. First, it would make crippling changes to current U.S. trafficking victim protection law that we fear would send these vulnerable children, and others in the future who have fled trauma, exploitation, and violence, back into harm's way, likely resulting in continued degradation, injury, and death for many of them. Second, it would not provide adequate funding for the Department of Health and Human Services Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) to enable it to care for vulnerable unaccompanied children in U.S. custody. Third, its level of funding for ORR is so low that it would severely hamper the agency's ability to fulfill its responsibility to care for refugees, asylum seekers, special immigrants, trafficking victims, and torture victims. And fourth, the measure contains no provisions to address the root causes that have compelled so many children to make the arduous journey from their homes in Central America to the United States and elsewhere in the region.

RETURN OF VULNERABLE CHILDREN TO THEIR HARM OR DEATH

In a recent message, His Holiness Pope Francis called on nations to exercise compassion for and care of the growing number of children fleeing violence in Central America who are seeking shelter and protection in the United States and elsewhere in the region. In his message, the Holy Father said of these children and their plight: ''Such an humanitarian emergency demands as its first measure the urgent protection and proper taking in of the children.'' We believe that H.R. 5230 fails that test.

We fear that the deprivations of basic due process contained in Title I of Division B of H.R. 5230 would result in the United States sending children who have relief available to them in the United States back to the conditions that they fled, and that this would result in many children being harmed and some being killed upon their return.

As we have stated in congressional testimony and in previous letters to Congress, this vulnerable group of children is fleeing violence from organized criminal networks. Many are likely to be eligible for a variety of forms of immigration relief, including asylum, trafficking visas (''T Visas''), visas for victims of crime (''U Visas''), Special Immigrant Juvenile visas (''SUS Visas''), and withholding of removal. As we have stated, sending these vulnerable children back into the hands of their persecutors and exploiters without a meaningful immigration hearing would severely decrease their opportunity for legal protection and possibly lead to their bodily harm or even death. We oppose the changes to the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 and the Immigration and Nationality Act contained in Title I of Division B of H.R. 5230 and believe that these provisions alone strongly warrant a vote against H.R. 5230.

INADEQUACY OF FUNDING TO CARE FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN

As you know, the Administration requested $1.8 billion in supplemental fiscal year 2014 funds to adequately and appropriately care for unaccompanied alien children in the United States. We are disappointed that Title V of Division A of H.R. 5230 would provide only $197 million for this purpose, a fraction of the funds requested by the Administration.

We believe that the Administration's request of $1.8 billion would have better ensured that these vulnerable children are placed in the least restrictive and most child-friendly setting in an expeditious manner. Among other things, such an amount would have permitted a portion of the funds to be used for post-release services, including home studies and case monitoring for children placed with families. These services would ensure that children are placed in a safe environment and that they are provided information about their immigration proceedings. The amount also would have provided for mental health counseling for children, who are traumatized from their long journey.

In contrast, H.R. 5230 provides $262 million to Interior and Customs Enforcement (ICE) custody operations, which would help fund an expansion of detention for children and families arriving at the border. We oppose this funding. Unaccompanied children and families with children should be placed in a least restrictive setting, not be detained in prison-like settings. We urge that some portion of these funds be used for community-based alternatives to detention for families.

REFUGEES, ASYLUM SEEKERS, SPECIAL IMMIGRANTS, AND TORTURE AND TRAFFICKING VICTIMS

As you may know, ORR recently announced its intention to reprogram $94 million of funding that was appropriated in fiscal year 2014 for refugee services and to use that funding, instead, to care for unaccompanied alien children. We commend the drafters of H.R. 5230 for their decision to partially reimburse ORR for its planned reprogramming refugee services funding. However, we are disappointed that the measure would designate only $47 million of the supplemental appropriations bill for this purpose, leaving the ORR account short of the funds it will need to carry out vital refugee resettlement activities for refugees and other vulnerable populations under ORR care.

We believe that any supplemental appropriations bill passed by Congress should provide a full reimbursement to ORR for any funds that are reprogrammed so that the agency can fulfill its mandate to resettle these groups, which includes refugees, asylees, Cuban and Haitian Entrants, Special Immigrants from Iraq and Afghanistan (who are now endangered after helping the United States with its mission in those countries), torture victims, and trafficking victims.

Because ORR ordinarily distributes much of its funds in the last quarter of one fiscal year to provide refugee services during the first quarter of the following fiscal year, ORR program money lost to reprograming in fiscal year 2014 could result in critical loss of services to refugees and other vulnerable populations in fiscal year 2015. The reprogrammed fiscal year 2014 money comes from a number of line items, including Refugee Social Services and Targeted Assistance Grants. These items provide critical programming to help refugees learn English and find jobs so that they can support themselves and their families. They also fund programs for the elderly, intensive case management for torture survivors and victims of trauma, home child care, and school impact grants to help both the children and their schools. Besides harming refugees and ORR's other vulnerable populations, the inadequate level of funding provided in H.R. 5230 could also contribute to depleted local refugee programs and the loss of local infrastructure that provides critical ORR support for refugees, children, and the above mentioned vulnerable populations, and for the communities that welcome them.

FAILURE TO ADDRESS ROOT CAUSES

We are disappointed that H.R. 5230 contains no funding to address push factors in Central America that are compelling children to leave their homes and make the arduous journey in search of protection in the United States and elsewhere in the region. We believe that funding to address the root causes in the countries of Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador is essential if we are to assist those governments in protecting their citizens and in providing hope for young people. We support funding for re-integration programs for these children and urge that funding be adequate to ensure that follow-up services are provided, including employment training and education. Moreover, we believe that funding should be provided to invest in at-risk youth in danger of gang recruitment, including mentoring services, skills training, and social support services. Catholic Relief Services, which is present in these countries, operates programs serving at-risk youth that have helped to prevent children from migrating to the United States. Funding also should be provided for improving youth employment in the region. The United States will need to make a long-lasting commitment to the region in order to make it safe for these children to live and flourish.

If the humanitarian and refugee crisis posed by children fleeing violence in Central America were happening anywhere else in the world, the United States would appropriately implore nations in that region to protect them from harm. We have done so in the case of Syrians, Iraqis, and Afghans fleeing persecution in the Near East; Somalis, Congolese, and Sudanese in Africa; and Burmese, Hmong, and Vietnamese in Southeast

Asia. In these and many other cases, we have urged the countries to which refugees and vulnerable migrants have fled to open their hearts and protect these vulnerable souls. We should do no less when the United States is itself faced with this humanitarian challenge.

How our nation responds to this challenge is a moral test of our national character. We ask that you oppose H.R. 5230, which we feel fails to live up to that test. Instead, we urge you to support the appropriation of supplemental fiscal year 2014 funding to address the increased number of unaccompanied children fleeing violence in Central America, without provisions that would undermine current legal and humanitarian protections for them and others.

Sincerely,

MOST REVEREND EUSEBIO ELIZONDO,
Auxiliary Bishop of Seattle,
Chairman, USCCB Committee on Migration.

EVANGELICAL IMMIGRATION TABLE,
July 22, 2014.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS, In a matter of months, more than 50,000 unaccompanied children have arrived in the United States. Millions of Americans have been moved by the plight of these children who are currently awaiting processing, with many asking how they can help.

Children are vulnerable even in the best of circumstances and warrant special protection beyond that offered to adults. This vulnerability is compounded among children who flee situations of criminal gangs, sexual violence, trauma and extreme poverty, without their parents to accompany them.

Evangelicals are guided by Jesus' admonitions to welcome and protect children (Matthew 18:6, Mark 9:37, Luke 18:15–17). As our nation responds to this humanitarian crisis, we are thankful for laws that protect children and provide for their needs. While our systems are currently stretched, our laws uphold basic child protection principles.

Accordingly, we are concerned about potential weakening of protections afforded by the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act (TVPRA) which was enacted in 2008 and reauthorized in 2013. The TVPRA ensures that victims of trafficking are not only identified and screened properly but that traffickers are penalized and brought to justice. It also appropriately assigns responsibility for the care of unaccompanied children to the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) and ensures that children are placed with their families when possible. By making the legal process clearer and more efficient for children, the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops found that since the passage and implementation of TVPRA 23 percent more children were assisted. The TVPRA is working according to its design. It should not be changed to address the current temporary situation. The law allows for responses to exceptional circumstances.

Additionally, we urge you to provide the necessary resources and policy guidance to address the current crisis, and then hold the Administration accountable for fulfilling its responsibilities under the law. Robust funding is needed for the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) in HHS which has extensive experience with vulnerable immigrants, including UACs, refugees, and victims of trafficking. To respond to this crisis, ORR is considering reprogramming funding from other refugee programs. Funds must not simply be transferred from one vulnerable population to another. More funding is needed. There should also be increased funding for immigration courts and judges to more quickly screen the children and counsel for children going through legal proceedings so they know their rights and can understand the process. More robust investment in effectively addressing root causes of migration in Central America and Mexico is also imperative.

As we pray for these children and also our nation, we are reminded of Matthew 19:13–14 in which Jesus said, ''Let the little children come to me, and do not hinder them.' Churches and faith-based organizations have long partnered with the federal government in serving immigrant children and families in the United States. Many churches and faith-based organizations are ready and committed to provide the same type of assistance and pastoral care in the case of these unaccompanied children.

We offer our prayers and service as you make important decisions about our nation's response to migrant children. We hope that any response you make will strengthen our country's tradition of providing safety and refuge to the vulnerable.

Sincerely,

Leith Anderson, President, National Association of Evangelicals; Stephan Bauman, President and CEO, World Relief; David Beckmann, President, Bread for the World; Noel Castellanos, CEO, Christian Community Development Association; Russell D. Moore, President, Southern Baptist Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission; William Robinson, Interim President, Council for Christian Colleges and Universities; Samuel Rodriguez, President, National Hispanic Christian Leadership Conference; Gabriel Salguero, President, National Latino Evangelical Coalition; Richard Stearns, President, World Vision U.S.; Jim Wallis, President and Founder, Sojourners.

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, July 31, 2014.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the American Bar Association and its nearly 400,000 members nationwide, I write to urge you to oppose H.R. 5230, the Secure the Southwest Border Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2014. Additional resources are surely needed to address the challenges created by the increased number of unaccompanied children entering the country. However, the funding provided in H.R. 5230 is grossly inadequate to meet many critical needs and the bill contains misguided provisions that would significantly diminish the legal protections provided to these children under current law.

H.R. 5230 would subject these children to an expedited screening process and require them to present their case before an immigration judge in just seven days. It further requires immigration judges to issue an order within 72 hours of the conclusion of each proceeding. These requirements place unfair and unrealistic burdens on both the children and the judges. Although the bill provides some additional funding for the immigration courts, it is not sufficient to avoid severely increasing the strains on this already overburdened and chronically under—resourced adjudication system. These provisions elevate speedy procedure over due process—an anathema to our system of justice and they are unnecessary.

In addition, H.R. 5230 provides no additional funding for legal representation. Due to their age, lack of education, language and cultural barriers, and the complexity of U.S. immigration law, these vulnerable children face insurmountable obstacles to proving their claims for protection before an immigration judge on their own. Many of these children also have suffered traumatic experiences before or during their journey to the United States; it is the children who are most likely be eligible for some relief under the law, such as victims or trafficking or persecution, who may be least able to articulate their experiences under this proposed procedure. This creates the likelihood that those children with a valid claim to asylum or other legal protection are the ones most likely to be returned to their home countries to face serious harm or even death.

There is no question that the rapid increase in unaccompanied children entering our country presents many difficult challenges that require our nation to respond. However, in the rush to address the current crisis, the United States cannot abandon the principles of fairness and due process. H.R. 5230 fails in this regard and we strongly urge you to vote against it.

Sincerely,

THOMAS M. SUSMAN.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN).

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his dedication and hard work in finding a solution to a problem that none of us created here in this Chamber.

I rise today in strong support of this supplemental appropriations bill for the crisis that is going on at our border. I am very proud of our Conference this week, seeking input and solutions from Members, taking the time to make sure that this legislation deals with the problem, and crafting this legislation to make sure that there are no loopholes and that we deal with the specifics and actually put a bill on the floor that should be supported.

Mr. Speaker, the Obama administration has ignored the law and unilaterally established immigration policy without the consent or counsel of Congress. Unfortunately, the humanitarian crisis on our Nation's southern border is the result of a lack of leadership.

To solve this problem, the legislation that we are debating provides critical funding for the National Guard in those States that are seeing an influx. It also authorizes additional judges to hear the increasing caseload that they are seeing grow and grow, more and more everyday. It also makes important reforms to current law to ensure equal and timely due process for all of those unaccompanied minors.

Mr. Speaker, common sense doesn't often prevail here in Washington, but I can tell you that commonsense Hoosiers in my district understand that, first of all, our border needs to be secure, so that our immigration system can then be reformed.

We are a Nation of immigrants. We all have a history in our families of those who have made the effort to come to this great country, and legal immigrants are looking for those opportunities that they have dreamed of.

I thank Chairman ROGERS for his work, and I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO).

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I sat here quietly listening to the argument from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and I find it absolutely amazing that they say because the President would not sign this bill and because the Senate would not pass this bill—they are right, the Senate wouldn't pass it. There are hundreds of bills on HARRY REID's desk that he will not bring to the floor for a vote, and certainly the President would not encourage that to be done.

But we are doing our job here in the House. We have put a lot of time and effort in this. We looked at this law and realized what had to be done. I come from a law-and-order background, and we don't have law and order. We have distrust, we have gangs coming across, we have drugs coming across the southern border, and my colleagues on the other side don't want to do anything about it.

Something that I find quite interesting about the other side, under the leadership of the former Speaker and under the leadership of their former leader, in 2009 and 2010, they had the House, the Senate, and the White House, and they knew this problem existed. They didn't have the strength to go after it back then, but now we are trying to make a political issue out of it now.

What we need to do is pass this legislation, make sure that these children get back to their families, and we need to line up and protect this border from people coming across.

Yes, it is true. I did the research on it. You might want to try it. You might want to try it, Madam Leader. Do the research on it. Do the research. I did it. That is one thing that you don't do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. MARINO. It works both ways, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will be in order. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. MARINO. With that, I urge my colleagues to vote for this legislation because, apparently, I hit the right nerve.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington, ADAM SMITH.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill and also to the bill that will follow. We have a humanitarian crisis on our border in this country, and neither this bill and certainly not the next bill on DACA does anything to address it.

These children are fleeing unimaginable violence and fleeing a life that they simply can no longer bear. It is not a problem of border security. These children are turning themselves in. They are simply fleeing the violence in their home countries, and they are not just coming to the United States. Belize, Costa Rica, and other countries have seen an uptick from Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras because of the unimaginable violence there.

Instead of dealing with this, we have a bill that is hopelessly inadequate in terms of funding. We will not provide enough judges and enough people to give these children the due process they deserve, and even worse than that, we are stripping them of any rights and any protections by sending them back as quickly as possible without the due process that this House voted for in 2008, was signed by President Bush, that gave these children the due process they deserve.

Then we are going one step further to undermine the ability of children who were brought into this country through no fault of their own, the DREAMers that we have long supported, and we are telling them that now they will not be allowed to stay in this country. This is a humanitarian crisis, not a border security issue.

I urge us to vote down both of these pieces of legislation.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT), the chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Thank you for yielding, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, it has been discussed throughout this debate this afternoon and this evening that we do face an unprecedented humanitarian emergency with literally thousands of unaccompanied alien children that are crossing our southwest border monthly, a number that has more than doubled since the last year.

It has been said by some that it is due to President Obama's mixed messages and the administration's unwillingness to enforce the law, but regardless of what the reason is, we have a crisis that is growing.

The bill that is before us this evening represents a simple, measured approach to the crisis at the border. It is not comprehensive immigration reform; rather, its focus is on fixing the issues within the context of the law, issues that have fueled the influx of these children.

It also streamlines the process to ensure that those who are not eligible for asylum are quickly and safely repatriated to their families while, at the same time, adding protection to make sure that children who have been trafficked or genuinely in need of asylum get that protection they need.

Like many of my colleagues, I appreciate the leadership's willingness to listen and address these matters in the bill that is before us. I think we have all come together and done a great job to craft this legislation. I believe this version now provides the necessary and appropriate language needed to move forward and to address the crisis that we are seeing.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I want to first thank all the people that worked so hard to put this language together, and it makes me feel good to see the team that has done so. But I also think there is a misunderstanding as to what happened with how we got to this OTM language, the Wilberforce language, that is current law that we are seeking to amend here.

There was a bill that was introduced in December of 2007 which was called Wilberforce. It had two provisions. One of them was that if you violated Federal law, you were exempt from the provisions that would have been beneficial to an unaccompanied alien child, and the other one was if you were a threat to national security.

Those provisions were taken out of it. A new bill was introduced on December 9, 2008. The next day was the last day of this session. We all put up our last votes, left the Capitol, and headed for the airport. There was a unanimous consent request that called the bill up.

They asked unanimous consent to discharge it from committee, called the bill up, passed it by voice in the House, sent it over to the Senate, where they took the lateral. They passed it by voice to the President of the United States. No Republican voted for this bill.

This is a bill that is the foundational excuse for the President, and this is what we are trying to fix here tonight.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, as we close this debate, I would like to address my remarks to our distinguished chairman with whom I have worked for quite a while, and just once again, I would like to say this bill deserves a ''no'' vote.

I look forward to working with you in a bipartisan way to pass a real comprehensive immigration reform bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, this is a fair bill. It solves a crisis on our border. It does so in a financially safe and responsible way. It strengthens the border. It humanely treats those who are in our custody now and arranges for them to be humanely returned to their home families, where the Presidents of the three countries told us, We want these children back; and so this bill will do that.

I urge an ''aye'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, as a nation, Americans have always valued children and families.

If we pass this inadequate, irresponsible bill tonight, we will be breaking from that tradition and turning our backs on America's enduring commitment to fairness and justice.

Two weeks ago, I visited the border with a bipartisan group of House and Senate colleagues.

There we saw small children as young as seven years old crowded into tiny cells, and

forced to sleep on cold concrete floors and benches.

What I saw shocked me as a mother and disappointed me as an American.

I left that day determined to do everything I could to ensure that these children, many of whom fled horrific violence, are treated with care and compassion.

That's why I'll be voting "no" on the bill before us.

Joining me and others who oppose this destructive legislation are faith leaders, anti-trafficking groups, and women's organizations.

This diverse coalition is united in the belief that children escaping violence and persecution deserve to be protected and treated with basic human dignity.

The influx of refugees from Central America has put a strain on our border and immigration agencies. These agencies need greater resources to handle the heart-wrenching situation at our border in a way that is consistent with our American values. When things get tough, and when our resolve is tested, we must not abandon the ideals that make America so special.

Instead, we must live up to our ideals, and back our lofty rhetoric with meaningful action. Passing a clean supplemental spending bill that addresses the causes and consequences of the humanitarian crisis at our border would be meaningful and effective action, because the Senate would pass that bill and the President would sign it.

The tired, scared, helpless kids I saw in that overcrowded Border Patrol station are counting on us. Instead of playing political games and falsely claiming our borders are at risk, we need to act like Americans and stand up for these vulnerable children.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this irresponsible and shameful Republican supplemental.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 710, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 189, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 478]

YEAS—223

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—189

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fincher
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garcia
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—20

Blumenauer
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Davis (CA)
DesJarlais
Ellison
Fattah
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Gene
Hanabusa
McDermott
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Ruiz
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schock
Speier

□ 2037

Mr. GOSAR changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 478 I was caught in traffic and couldn't reach the floor. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote 478 (On Passage of H.R. 5230), had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

PROHIBITIONS RELATING TO DEFERRED ACTION FOR ALIENS

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 710, I call up the bill (H.R. 5272) to prohibit certain actions with respect to deferred action for aliens not lawfully present in the United States, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 710, the amendment printed in part B of House Report 113–571 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 5272

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. LIMITATION ON DEFERRED ACTION FOR CHILDHOOD ARRIVALS; RESTRICTIONS ON EMPLOYMENT AUTHORIZATION FOR ALIENS NOT IN LAWFUL STATUS.

No agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government may use Federal funding or resources after July 30, 2014—

(1) to consider or adjudicate any new or previously denied application of any alien requesting consideration of deferred action for childhood arrivals, as authorized by Executive memorandum dated June 15, 2012 and effective on August 15, 2012 (or by any other

succeeding Executive memorandum or policy authorizing a similar program);

(2) to newly authorize deferred action for any class of aliens not lawfully present in the United States; or

(3) to authorize any alien to work in the United States if such alien—

(A) was not lawfully admitted into the United States in compliance with the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.); and

(B) is not in lawful status in the United States on the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 5272.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5272 prohibits Federal funding or resources from being used to adjudicate any application for the President's Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, or DACA, program; and it prohibits the President from issuing employment authorization documents to unlawful immigrants in the United States.

This bill differs from the bill the House was set to consider yesterday in that it prohibits funds from being used for adjudication. The prior version of this bill was a simple prohibition on the President's actions.

□ 2045

According to U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services Director Leon Rodriguez, the President's Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program has already allowed over 714,000 unlawful immigrants, who claimed to have arrived as minors, to remain in the United States and seek employment. DACA is a major reason for the unprecedented influx of minors and family units along our southern borders.

This deferred action program was announced by the President and the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security on June 15, 2012.

It is a usurpation of the plenary authority over immigration law that article I, section 8, clause 4 of the United States Constitution confers on the legislative branch.

And the President knows that it is a usurpation of congressional authority. In fact, in March of 2011, he stated: ''With respect to the notion that I can just suspend deportations through executive order, that's just not the case, because there are laws on the books that Congress has passed. The executive branch's job is to enforce and implement those laws. There are enough laws on the books by Congress that are very clear in terms of how we have to enforce our immigration system that for me to simply, through executive order, ignore these congressional mandates would not conform with my appropriate role as President.''

Despite this admission, just over a year later, the President implemented the DACA program. And today it stands as a beacon for any unlawful immigrant to simply cross into the United States illegally because word has gotten out that they will be given permission to stay. I heard this again and again from unlawful immigrants in Border Patrol custody when I visited the Rio Grande Valley earlier this month.

So let's be clear: the President's administrative policies abandoning immigration enforcement and his promises about future administrative legalizations continue to encourage unlawful immigrant parents to smuggle their children into the United States. These policies and promises put money directly into the pockets of human smuggling and drug cartels and put children at risk of perilous, illicit journeys to the United States. And they undermine the fundamental constitutional principles that Congress creates the laws and the President is bound to enforce them.

H.R. 5272 sends the vitally important message that minors tempted to come here in the future will no longer be rewarded by a President who chooses to use his pen and cell phone to legislate. They will have absolutely no opportunity to receive DACA benefits.

I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) for introducing the bill and urge my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, I strongly oppose H.R. 5272. This, in all honesty and candor, is one of the most mean-spirited and anti-immigrant pieces of legislation I have seen in all of my years in the Congress.

Now, the main reason, of course, is that it would unfairly harm current and future DREAM Act kids. The majority have been clear about their intent with this bill: No DREAMers.

This legislation is designed to prevent young people who have lived here most of their lives and are members of our communities from benefiting from deferred action. It would foreclose the administration from focusing resources on identifying and removing individuals such as criminals and gang members from our communities. And even worse, the legislation would mean that the hundreds of thousands of young people who have already benefited from deferred action, who are contributing to our economy, participating in our communities, and obtaining an education could be deported in less than 2 years. And that is why the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, the AFL–CIO, and the American Civil Liberties Union, ACLU, have already registered their strong opposition to the bill.

I am confident that there are many more who would oppose this legislation because it seeks to roll back protections supported by civil rights organizations, religious organizations, college and university presidents, labor unions, and national educational organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I will now yield to both the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader, for purposes of a colloquy. And I will begin by yielding to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for yielding.

There is a section within the bill, which we just passed, that provides that the Attorney General—who is currently under contempt of Congress—will appoint the 40 new immigration judges established in the bill. A number of us have a problem with that. And I know that concerns you, Chairman GOODLATTE.

I believe that you, as Judiciary chairman, have agreed to work on a solution to deal with that issue going forward and to attempt to craft a solution that would be acceptable to a majority of the committee. Is that correct, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. GOODLATTE. That is correct.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. And I can assure you that I will work with Chairman GOODLATTE in an effort to remedy that problem.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank you both so much for your commitment.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ).

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. How did we get here? In the dark of night, Republicans are voting to deport DREAMers, take away the DACA program, and make every undocumented immigrant deportable.

In November of 2012, the Republicans were shellshocked, and they spoke of turning over a new leaf with young voters, with Asian voters, with women, and Latinos.

A year ago, I was working with Congressman SAM JOHNSON and Judge CARTER of Texas. I did town hall meetings and public appearances with Judge CARTER and with Congressman VALADAO. I worked with MIKE COFFMAN of Denver and stood up with AARON SCHOCK and ADAM KINZINGER in my own State of Illinois.

But now STEVE KING, MICHELE BACHMANN, and TED CRUZ are literally writing the immigration script for the Republican Party, a script filled with ugly and mean policies that demonize

children and marginalize immigrants and destroy families.

In January, you were saying that all of the DREAMers should get green cards and citizenship. We always understood you wanted to deport their parents.

But now, late on a Friday night, you are going after the DREAMers, who have known no other country but this one, who risked their identities and their families to come forward and sign up with the Department of Homeland Security and pass FBI background checks so they could get right with the law.

The United States said, come forward and get right with the law. And now Republicans are saying they should go back in the shadows, back to a life of fear, where opportunities are few, and their futures are uncertain.

The voters had a referendum on the program back in 2012, and the winner was President Obama, the DREAMers, and the American people. But now you want to take all of that away. Thank God the Senate is gone. The President has called this ''veto bait,'' and this will never become law.

Is there no one in your conference who can stand up and talk sensibly when others in your party want to demonize children at the border and deport the DREAMers who live in our neighborhoods across America? You are so frozen in fear of your own voters, so frozen in fear of your own colleagues, and the Nation needs you to be courageous.

Only cowards scapegoat children. And only those who are ashamed of themselves do it in the night, on a Friday. You are apparently not strong enough to stand up and craft real solution to America's problems.

But here is the truth revealed about the Republican Party in the last few weeks, and why all of the talk this year about immigration reform was just talk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. In the end, the Republican position on immigration can be summed up as ''deport 'em all.'' When push comes to shove, your party is standing by the simplistic desire to deport 'em all.

Most of you know that the approach of deport 'em all is nonsense, and you know it is suicide as a political strategy. But you continue to say, deport 'em all. Shame on those who will not stand up for the children at the border, and shame on all those who will not stand in the neighborhoods of our communities for the children who live with us.

Say ''no'' to this bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to say that this bill does not deport anyone. This bill simply freezes a program that violates the United States Constitution.

So now, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. I thank the chairman for his excellent work on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, tonight, the U.S. House of Representatives has passed, with my support, a strong border security bill. And I rise in support of this second reform bill that would, if enacted, immediately and effectively address the humanitarian and national security crisis that has developed along the southern border of the United States.

This crisis, which will result in an estimated 90,000 unaccompanied children entering the United States illegally through the end of this fiscal year, representing a 1,381 percent increase since 2009, was entirely caused by the Obama administration's failure to secure the border, its unwillingness to enforce existing laws, and its disastrous 2012 Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, which invited this surge in illegal immigration.

The action taken by the House tonight is a serious, bold, and thoughtful legislative response to President Obama's failure to secure the border and ensure that the laws are faithfully executed.

But there is a second and very important reason besides a policy reason why every Member of this House should support this legislation, and that is to vindicate the separation of powers.

There was a U.S. Supreme Court case in 1983 that dealt with an immigration issue, INS v. Chadha. And in that case, the Supreme Court talked about the procedure that the Constitution outlines to change the law, how legislation is enacted in accordance with constitutional command. And the court held that there was a single, finely wrought, and exhaustively considered procedure for enacting legislation. And unilateral executive memoranda from the White House is not the way to change the law.

So if you are interested in vindicating the separation of powers, if you believe that the way to change the law—even if you believe in the DREAM Act, even if you believe in the President's policy of deferred action—the way that we do that is through constitutional procedure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BARR. So there is not just a policy issue at stake here, not just a humanitarian and national security issue at stake—the Constitution is at stake.

So I appreciate the House leadership for heeding the call that I and many of my colleagues made to stay in session and finish the work of the American people before the start of the August district work period.

I strongly urge the Senate and President Obama to do their jobs, stop trying to score political points, listen to the American people, pass this bill, and join the House in solving this very important problem.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. How much time remains on either side, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 25½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Virginia has 22½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. At this time, its my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the brand-new majority whip of the United States Congress.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Virginia, for bringing this bill to the floor and for his leadership on Mrs. BLACKBURN's legislation.

Mr. Speaker, if you go back and look at DACA in 2012, when it was issued as an executive order, it was an example of President Obama's executive overreach.

Some want to make this a partisan issue, yet, Mr. Speaker, more than a dozen times, the United States Supreme Court has issued 9–0 rulings that President Obama has overreached his executive authority. That is not a 5–4 decision. That is 9–0. Ruth Bader Ginsburg recognized more than a dozen times this President has overreached his executive authority.

□ 2100

Mr. Speaker, why is this DACA ruling so dangerous? This has been the magnet that has led to the flood of people coming across our border. This crisis at the border is partially responsible to the DACA ruling. We have got to stop having this kind of message go out that has led not only to a flood of people coming across our border, but has led to and can be responsible for the human trafficking that is going on. There are so many devastating things that this has done. We have got to stop this overreach.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas, SHEILA JACKSON LEE, a distinguished member of the judiciary committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I hope the Speaker says that word from Texas very loud because I listened earlier today of all of the relief in the appropriations bill given to Texans down at the border, $594 million.

Let me tell you that there are people in Texas who are ready to serve and help the unaccompanied children. There are people in Texas who recognize that we are the good Samaritans. Don't label us with wanting $594 million, and don't label us with standing against the DACA children, the DREAMers, who have come to this country and been here for 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, these children ran into the arms of the Border Patrol. There is no criminal or legal crisis at the border, but the DACA bill that is here on

the floor of the House is a disgrace to the words of the Star-Spangled Banner. We are the home of the free and the brave. We are free enough to be able to welcome those in need.

This body knows that DACA has nothing to do with the unaccompanied children, and it is a disgrace that we would undermine the hardworking students like Juan Jesus in my office this summer, that we would undermine it with a disgraceful bill—a disgraceful bill. It is disgraceful. Pass comprehensive immigration reform.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5272, a bill brought to the floor at the eleventh hour by the House Republican leadership to placate its extreme right-wing Tea Party faction and one of the most hypocritical, irresponsible, and mean-spirited legislative proposals brought to the House floor this year.

H.R. 5272 seeks to prohibit the Administration from exercising its administrative discretion to focus resources on identifying and apprehending those aliens who are present in country illegally who pose the most serious danger to our national security and the safety of our citizens.

This cynical bill is hypocritical because the vast majority of its proponents have been claiming for years now that the reason they refuse to compromise on budget issues, support for sequestration, and voted to shut down the government is because of their belief in the importance of setting spending priorities.

Yet, H.R. 5272 would deny ICE the ability to use its limited resources in the most efficient manner to achieve its highest priorities which is to apprehend, detain, and remove aliens who pose a danger to national security or a risk to public safety.

This bill is irresponsible because it seeks to prevent trained, experienced, and professional agents and prosecutors from exercising their discretion and acting on the basis of what everyone knows to be true: that there is a vast difference between a terrorist bent on harming America and a DREAM Act kid studying hard in school so he or she can graduate, join the Armed Services and willingly risk his or her life to defend the country, or go to work to support his or her family.

This inefficient use of resources wastes taxpayer dollars and does nothing to keep America safe.

This bill is mean-spirited because it would have ICE target its limited resources on innocent, law abiding, young people who were brought to this country as children and would have them deported to a foreign land even though America is the country they may know as home and the only one to which they may have ever pledged allegiance.

Mr. Speaker, I traveled many times to Iraq and Afghanistan and always the highlight of my visit was meeting the young men and women who were willingly risking their lives to defend the country they love more than life.

More than 5,000 of the soldiers who fought for us in Afghanistan and Iraq were not yet American citizens but DREAMers who dreamed that one day they might become citizens of the nation they gladly risked their lives to defend.

Instead of honoring their service, this heartless bill before us crushes their dream by forcing ICE agents and prosecutors to pretend that there is no difference between one of these veterans who came to this country as an undocumented immigrant and an alien engaged in or suspected of espionage or terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5272 also wastes the money of hard-working taxpayers and does nothing to make America safer, and eliminates a fair and just policy legal under the President's executive authority which allows for relief for young children who have been in America for a certain number of years, follow certain requirements and may be deferred from deportation to serve in the U.S. military, go to school and contribute to America.

And, just as bad, it is inconsistent with American values of justice and fair play.

We must address our broken immigration system through comprehensive reform rather than extinguish Ms. Liberty's lamp of freedom or close her Golden Door.

We are better than that and I urge all Members to join me in rejecting this terrible legislation.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Virginia, Chairman GOODLATTE, for yielding. There are a lot of people in this Congress that I appreciate a great deal tonight, but I have listened to the anger and the fury over on the other side, and I have never seen the Sergeant at Arms have to come and clear the floor like we have seen here tonight.

I am wondering what is this about? I would take this back to the State of the Union Address when I watched the President of the United States here on the rostrum speak, and he said, essentially, the summary of what he has delivered to America a number of times: Congress, I am going to tell you what to do, and if you don't do it, I am going to use either my cell phone or my ink pen, and I am going to do it. Here it goes again, Mr. Speaker.

What I saw was this, our Founding Fathers set up this balance in our Constitution between the three branches of government, articles I, II, and III, the legislative, the executive, and the judicial branch of government.

They drew as fine a line as they could between the three, but they always knew that there would be a gray area, and they anticipated that each branch of government would jealously protect the constitutional authority that is vested within it within the Constitution, the supreme law of the land.

When the President said, I am going to usurp your legislative authority, I am going to take over article I, and I am going to legislate if you don't do what I tell you, what happened? The people that are applauding now applauded then, and they said, Mr. President, take the power that is in the Constitution, take it from me, take article I, too, take your pen, take your cell phone. You run this country as if you were a king, rather than only the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, that is what this debate is about here. This is about the DACA language that the President has introduced 2-plus years ago, and I said then when we had Hill hearings before the Judiciary Committee and Janet Napolitano—I said that we will take you to court on this, this will be litigated.

It will be litigated because the President does not have legislative authority. He is only the President of the United States. If the President wants to somehow grant amnesty to one person, he has some prosecutorial discretion to do that, but they argued in the Morton Memos, and they argued in the DACA memos—seven times in the Morton Memos—on an individual basis only, on an individual basis only, prosecutorial discretion on an individual basis only.

They put it in there seven times because they knew they were wrong, and they knew it was going to be litigated. You don't do 700,000 people on an individual basis only. You don't suspend the law. If the President wants the law changed, he knows to come to Congress, ask us—and ask us, and when you take an oath to uphold the Constitution, you had better believe that it means what it says.

Why would you just throw your authority over the side and say, Mr. President, take this from us? That is not what you pledged to your constituents. That is not the oath that you take.

So what this says is that the DACA language says this: Mr. President, stop violating the Constitution from this point forward. As the chairman said, it does not deport anybody. It just restores constitutional article I authority.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, this just restores the constitutional authority of the United States Congress, and it says: President Obama, don't continue to violate this Constitution. President Obama, when you waved your ink pen at us a week and a half ago and you said you were going to legalize 5 to 6 million people, it is unconstitutional.

He knows it. He has many times given the lecture that he knows it. He gave his word, and he needs to keep it. I want to remind him, it won't go cheap if you try this, Mr. President. I urge the adoption of this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members of the House are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA).

Mr. HINOJOSA. Thank you, Congressman CONYERS.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, I rise today to strongly oppose H.R. 5272, an extreme and highly partisan bill that

would prevent the continuation or expansion of President Obama's Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, known as DACA.

Simply put, this misguided bill limits President Obama's prosecutorial discretion and seeks to dismantle the DACA program. I am very concerned that the majority has brought this anti-Hispanic amended bill to the floor in order to prevent President Obama from building upon the successes of the DACA program and to appease the most extreme wing of the Republican Conference.

The underlying bill punishes hard-working DREAMers and immigrants who are eager to contribute to America's prosperity and have waited long enough for comprehensive immigration reform.

Since its inception in 2012, the DACA program has protected DREAMers who meet certain requirements from deportation, allowing hundreds of thousands of young undocumented immigrants who were brought to the United States as children to remain and work in the United States.

In my view, closing the door on undocumented youth is un-American. We in the Congress of the United States have a moral responsibility to protect the welfare and rights of vulnerable children and youth, including children and youth who are undocumented or are fleeing from violence and despair in their countries of origin.

Mr. Speaker, I close by urging my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in strong opposition to H.R. 5272, extreme and highly partisan legislation that does nothing to fix our Nation's broken immigration system.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. LABRADOR), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, as I sit here and I listen to the other side talk about this issue, I wonder if they even understand what is happening at the border.

In 2011, there were only 6,500 children coming to the border. In 2012, the President acted through DACA, and we started seeing an increase of these children coming to the border. Today, in 2014, we will have 90,000 children rushing to the border, and next year, it is estimated that we will have 142,000 children coming to the border.

Almost 2 months ago, Gilberto Ramos, a 15-year-old boy from Guatemala, was found lying in brush, dead from the heat. Many of these children that are coming to the border don't make it across the river. There are reports of discoveries of small, lifeless bodies washed up along the riverbanks. Many of these children are abused, they are victimized, and they are raped.

We must understand that the President is responsible because of his failure to fully comply with the law. We have heard a lot from the other side that the President acted because we did not act. Well, that is not true.

The reality is that the President and his party had majorities in both Houses of Congress for 2 years, and you failed to act, so don't point your finger at us. In November of 2012—in November of 2012—we passed in this House a STEM Jobs Act, which was the beginning of a step-by-step approach to actually deal with the immigration process. What did you do? You didn't vote for it, and the Senate refused to take it up.

In September of 2011, we passed here in the House the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act, and the Senate again refused to act, which would have been the beginning of a step-by-step approach for us to deal with the immigration process. You have refused to do small things.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

The gentleman is reminded to direct his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. LABRADOR. Stop the hypocrisy. If you truly care about these kids, stop encouraging them to come to the United States illegally. They are crossing the border. Most of them are being harmed, many of them are being abused, and a few of them are dying.

It is time for us to stop this nonsense and to have the President of the United States actually follow the law and work with the Congress, so we can actually do immigration reform.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN).

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. GOODLATTE and Mrs. BLACKBURN who is responsible for this wonderful bill this evening, which I wholeheartedly support. This is why: last weekend, I think the Nation was stunned when our President said that he would unilaterally use his power—raw power—to effectively grant amnesty to 5 to 6 million foreign nationals here in the United States illegally.

He said that he would do that with his power, and what happened this week is that this body came together and we decided to answer the President's unconstitutional call.

So with this DACA bill, effectively, we will put forward the strongest possible legislative response that this body could put forward. We say in this bill that the President has no power, no authority administratively to grant permits which would effectively grant amnesty to 5 to 6 million foreign nationals illegally in the United States.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, we will put a handcuff on one of the President's hands.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Now, in the United States Senate, the majority leader, HARRY REID, has left town. He has left town. Not only did he fail to complete an immigration bill, but he knows full well that President Obama may illegally grant amnesty to 5 to 6 million foreign nationals illegally in the United States without doing anything.

What HARRY REID has the opportunity to do is to come back and join us. We will be here any time, any day, anywhere, anyhow. We will join him here in August, September, whenever, and he needs to put the other handcuff on this lawless President's hands, so we constrain this President from granting amnesty.

Mr. Speaker, that is what the American people want us to do. We do that tonight with this bill. We invite HARRY REID to bring the Senate back and put the handcuff on the President's other hand, so that we can have sovereignty again on our southern border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

□ 2115

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Rhode Island will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, my inquiry is: Is it not a fact that we are here because the Republicans opposed this legislation in the Senate and there were not sufficient votes to move the bill and that is why we are here?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who comes from the State of Texas, and like many in this House, I have been down on the Texas-Mexico border. I was there last weekend. You have to be there to know what is going on. I went up and down the Rio Grande River with law enforcement officers from the State of Texas. We see the people on the Mexican side—and I think the Mexican Government is complicit—just waiting for us to pass, and then they start coming across.

And the other side talks about it just being one group of people—children. Well, that is just not true, because the people who are being apprehended are not just children. A lot of them are teenagers. A lot of them are older. The chief of Border Patrol of the McAllen sector said there are 144 nations that came across the border this year represented. Just a week ago before I got there, there were three Ukrainians.

Why, Mr. Speaker? Why is everybody coming to America through south Texas? Because they believe wherever they start out, whether it is kids in

Honduras looking for a better life, or terrorists, or Ukrainians, or someone else, they believe that this President, this administration, said: You get to America, we are going to let you stay.

We have all kinds of different legal reasons. Some of it is called DACA, and there are other reasons. But the bottom line is you are going to get to stay in America, and Americans will take care of your needs. That is what they believe. And the reason they believe that is because the rule of law is not being enforced in America.

Third World countries protect their borders better than the United States.

And who is benefiting from all of this? Well, it is not the kids. As pointed out, many of them are dying or getting hurt. It is not America. It is not legal immigrants. Who is benefiting? It is the drug cartels, the criminal gangs, the MS–13 gang. They are making money off the fact that the rule of law in this country is not being enforced.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. POE of Texas. The rule of law is not enforced when it comes to the sovereignty and security of the Nation. And that is all we are asking. Let's have some rules and follow them so people all over the world who want to come to America, let them know there is a right way to come. And the wrong way is they shouldn't believe that you get here, you are going to get to stay because the administration is not going to enforce the law. That is why we have the chaos. That is why we have the 50,000 to 60,000 people crossing in south Texas.

So all we are trying to do with this little piece of legislation is get back to let's enforce the rule of law. Let's not grant amnesty and let's not treat people from different countries differently. Let's treat them all the same way. That is why I support this legislation, because it will send the message that even in America the rule of law will be enforced.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POE of Texas. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I know you said that is just the way it is, and I agree, but I just want to make an added point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman if he will yield to me.

Mr. POE of Texas. I continue to yield to the chairman.

Mr. GOODLATTE. So 50,000 coming across the border, that is 50,000 unaccompanied minors coming to the border, and they are a small percentage of the total number of people. Eighty-five percent of the people coming to the border right now—and all categories are up. Children are up most, but all categories are up, and 85 percent are not unaccompanied minors.

So the gentleman makes a very valid point about the crisis at our border and the cause of that crisis. The President caused it. The President can solve it. The President should act now, and we need to send a strong message that America is not open to people who violate our laws.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, my parliamentary inquiry as to the bill that is on the floor, is this not the bill dealing with deferred action for juveniles or young people who have been in this country for 5 years, graduated from high school, going to college or working, and in actuality is not dealing with the unaccompanied children? But more importantly, is it not true that this bill is destined for a veto, will not be passed in the Senate, and in essence, we are here passing a bill that has no future?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, we are ready to close on this side.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I also only have one speaker remaining and am prepared to close.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), a senior member of the Judiciary Committee, to close.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, some Members have asked whether this bill terminates deferred action for DREAMers with DACA. This question was put to Chairman GOODLATTE at the Rules Committee today, and he answered, as I saw on TV, that the text speaks for itself. He is right. The text does speak for itself. And on lines 5 through 7 on page 1, the text clearly terminates DACA by prohibiting DREAMers from applying to renew their deferred action, which they must do after a 2-year time period.

It also prevents future deferred action to ensure that we continue to deport the parents of the DREAMers and parents of U.S. citizen children, sending those children, by the way, into foster care, or prevent DREAMers who have not yet filed for deferred action from doing so.

So basically, this bill will have the effect of removing DACA from the DREAMers and making them deportable.

Now, there has been a lot of discussion about the role that DACA has had, and I will put into the RECORD a report from the Cato Institute, titled, ''DACA Did Not Cause the Surge in Unaccompanied Children.'' If you do statistic analysis, you can see that it is impossible that DACA has been the cause of these children coming from the three war-torn countries, as the report reports.

[From the Cato Institute, July 29, 2014]

DACA DID NOT CAUSE THE SURGE IN UNACCOMPANIED CHILDREN

(By Alex Nowrasteh)

In June, 2012 the Obama Administration announced that it had authored a memo deferring the deportation of unauthorized immigrant childhood arrivals in the United States, a program known as deferred action for childhood arrivals (DACA). The memo directed then Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security to practice prosecutorial discretion toward a small number of unauthorized immigrants who fulfilled a specific set of characteristics. In essence, some unauthorized immigrants who had come to the United States as children were able to legally stay and work—at least temporarily.

DID DACA CAUSE THE UAC SURGE?

Some politicians contend that DACA is primarily responsible for the surge in unaccompanied child (UAC) migrants across the border in recent years. A recent House Appropriations Committee one-pager stated that, ''The dire situation on our Southern border has been exacerbated by the President's current immigration policies.'' Proponents of this theory argue that DACA sent a message to Central Americans that if they came as children then the U.S. government would legalize them, thus giving a large incentive for them to come in the first place. Few facts of the unaccompanied children (UAC) surge are consistent with the theory that DACA caused the surge.

First, the surge in UAC began long before the June 15, 2012 announcement of DACA. It is true that DACA had been discussed in late May 2012 but the surge was underway by that time. From October 2011 through March 2012, there was a 93 percent increase in UAC apprehensions over the same period in Fiscal Year 2011. Texas Governor Rick Perry warned President Obama about the rapid increase in UAC at the border in early May 2012—more than a full month before DACA was announced. In early June 2012, Mexico was detaining twice as many Central American children as in 2011. The surge in unaccompanied children (UAC) began before DACA was announced.

Second, the children coming now are not legally able to apply for DACA. A recipient of DACA has to have resided in the United States continuously from June 15, 2007 to June 15, 2012, a requirement that excludes the unaccompanied children coming now.

Third, if DACA was such an incentive for UAC to come from Central America, why are so few Nicaraguan children coming? They would benefit in the same way as unaccompanied children from El Salvdaor, Honduras, and Guatemala. The lack of Nicaraguans points to other causes of the surge.

The timing, legal exclusion of the UAC from DACA, and lack of Nicaraguans indicate that DACA was not a primary cause of the surge. Of the 404 UAC interviewed by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees since 2011, only 9 mentioned that U.S. laws influenced their decision to come to the United States. Other American laws could have influenced the unaccompanied children to come but DACA is not the main culprit.

DETAILS ON DACA

The DACA beneficiaries, at the time of the memo, would have to fulfill all of these requirements to have their deportations deferred: under the age of 31; arrived to the United States before reaching their 16th birthday; entered the United States without

inspection or overstayed a visa prior to June 15, 2012; continuously resided in the United States from June 15, 2007 to the time of the memo; physically present in the United States on June 15, 2012, as well as at the time of requesting deferred action from United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS); been in school at the time of application, or have already graduated or obtained a certificate of completion from high school, or have obtained a general education development (GED) certificate, or are an honorably discharged veteran of the U.S. Coast Guard or the U.S. Armed Forces; not been convicted of a felony, significant misdemeanor, or three or more other misdemeanors, and do not otherwise pose a threat to national security or public safety.

Beneficiaries of DACA were also allowed to apply for employment authorization according to the Code of Federal Regulations. There is a debate amongst legal scholars over whether the administration's grant of deferred action was legal. Those who argue that DACA was illegal contend that the President overstepped his constitutional authority to defer the deportation of some unauthorized immigrants. Those who argue that DACA was legal point to the general power of the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security to defer enforcement action. They argue that the Supreme Court has ruled that decisions to initiate or terminate enforcement proceedings fall within the authority of the Executive—an enforcement power used since the early 1970s. Here is more of their argument. This disagreement has not been settled.

By the end of September, 2013, 580,000 requests for DACA were accepted by the U.S. government and 514,800, or 89 percent, were approved. Seventy-six percent of the requests came from Mexicans. Twenty-nine percent of the requests were filed from California, 16 percent from Texas, and 6 percent from Illinois.

Read the Full Article: DACA Did Not Cause the Surge in Unaccompanied Children

Ms. LOFGREN. Now, we know that this bill would eliminate DACA for DREAMers and make them deportable, but few in this body may know that the bill also returns to our bitter 2-year fight about reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act. It took this House 2 years to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act at the beginning of this Congress, and when we did it, we did it over the strong opposition of the majority of House Republicans.

Today's bill undermines the basic premise of that act, that victims of domestic violence should be empowered to leave their abusers. It does that by denying the ability of battered immigrant spouses who have left their abusers and successfully self-petitioned for a VAWA visa the ability to work for the months it may take for a visa number to become available. This one change will prevent countless battered immigrant spouses from ever leaving their abusers and will drive others right back into the hands of their abusers.

Now, we have heard a lot of discussion about the law, but I think it is important to recall that the ability to make prosecutorial decisions is well-grounded in the law. In fact, in 1999, I recall well the letter sent by then-Chairman Henry Hyde, signed by 28 bipartisan Members of Congress, to the Clinton administration asking for the use of prosecutorial discretion. And most recently, the Supreme Court in the Arizona case recognized the broad authority of the administration to make decisions about whom to prosecute. The Arizona case reaffirmed the legality of the deferred action program.

So all this discussion to the contrary is really nothing more than legal nonsense.

What does this bill do?

It deports the DREAMers. It reinvigorates the Republican war on women by forcing women with VAWA visas back to their abusers. This is bad policy. It is an outrageous bill. It is being done in the worst possible process, and I wish so much that the Republicans had reached out, taken the offer of our leaders to sit down and work together to come up with a solution that really works for our country instead of deporting the DREAMers who are so much the hope and future of our great American Nation.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to say that DACA is more than just abuse of prosecutorial discretion. It also creates benefits that are not provided for under the law.

At this time, it is my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the chief sponsor of this legislation.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

I rise in support of my amendment to prevent the extension of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program that was indeed unlawfully put in place by an executive memo on August 15, 2012. What this amendment does is to return us to the original language of H.R. 5160. Plus, it strengthens that original language by looking beyond July 30. What it will do is to tie the President's hands as to future executive actions that he might take to expand amnesty for illegal entrants into this country. It would freeze DACA.

Now, I want to read the bill because it is not a lengthy bill. Beginning on line 1, section 1, Limitation on deferred action for childhood arrivals; restrictions on employment authorization for aliens not in lawful status.

No agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government may use Federal funding or resources after July 30, 2014:

One, to consider or adjudicate any new or previously denied application of any alien requesting consideration of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, as authorized by the executive memo dated June 15, 2012, and effective on August 15, 2012, or by any other succeeding executive memorandum or policy authorizing a similar program.

Number two, to newly authorize deferred action for any class of aliens not lawfully present in the United States.

Number three, to authorize any alien to work in the U.S. if such alien, A, was not lawfully admitted into the U.S. in compliance with the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.); and, B, is not in lawful status in the U.S. on the date of the enactment of this act.

That is it. That is it. That is what is in this piece of legislation.

What it does, in effect, is to give Central American children a false hope. It says that they are going to be able to obtain amnesty, as those before them have done in this program. And the reason we are so concerned about this and the reason my colleagues have come and have talked about their concern, what is happening is you have the traffickers, you have the smugglers, you have the coyotes who are preying on these innocent people. And they believe if these children can make it here, they will get amnesty. It is a false hope. Certainly we know and we care about these families. We know these countries want to get their children back and reunite them with their families in their home countries.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what we are hearing is that the administration would like to expand DACA. Indeed, we have heard that the President has instructed Secretary Johnson and General Holder to come up with a list of executive actions to address immigration.

□ 2130

The increase and the statistics that Mr. LABRADOR gave us on the percentages of increase cannot be denied.

We see what is happening on this border. Mr. POE talked about what he has seen happening with those families. And true to form, just as Governor Perry warned us in 2012 that this was going to happen, indeed, it is. We are seeing this unprecedented increase going back to 2009, looking at where we are with today, with the children, with the teens, with the adults that are streaming across this border and are disrupting life along the southern border for American families.

I want to make one other point. Chairman GOODLATTE mentioned this earlier. We have talked a little bit about the Constitution tonight, and, indeed, we all know that when you look at the Constitution, article I, section 8, clause 4, that is where those enumerated powers are given to Congress. They are given to Congress ''to establish an uniform rule of naturalization.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5272 In this legislation, Republicans are turning their backs on children, toddlers, and infants who are trying to escape violence and abuse. The reality is that there is a humanitarian crisis on our doorstep.

Militarizing these borders and expelling children are not long-term solutions. If you read in the news about a country taking these actions, you would assume it was a third-world dictatorship—not the U.S. Instead, we should be rising to the occasion—not cowering from it.

Republicans say that they are just closing a loophole. But, they are really slamming the door shut. Subjecting 5 year-olds to sham legal hearings without counsel is un-American. What's next for the Republicans, sending these kids to Guantanamo Bay?

The reality is that this is a cowardly approach. Time and time again Republicans say ''Deport them!'' But we know that this does not work—and we do know this is not right.

We like to call ourselves ''the land of brave.'' But the real ''brave ones'' are those children who travel thousands of miles to reach a better place. We must reject this unjust and dehumanizing Republican bill.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this mean-spirited bill that will slam the door in the faces of young DREAM Act students who know America as their only home, their only country.

Rarely have I seen fear and hatred turned into an actual piece of legislation and debated on the floor of the People's House.

This GOP bill proposes to deport DREAM Act students like Jose Godinez-Samperio from Tampa, Florida, who was only 9 when his parents brought him to the United States.

He has done everything right. Jose graduated as Valedictorian from Armwood High School in Hillsborough County.

Jose graduated from the State of Florida's Honors College, New College, and then graduated from law school with honors from Florida State University College of Law.

He passed the bar exam, and this year the Republican-dominated Florida Legislature said Jose should receive his license to practice law. They passed a law to do so. In fact, Republicans and Democrats gave him a standing ovation.

There are hundreds of thousands of students like Jose across America tonight who have been living in limbo, waiting for Congress to pass comprehensive immigration reform. They were given a lifeline by the President through the DREAM Act and America has invested in them.

Now, the Republican Congress is moving us farther away from immigration reform, farther away from justice, farther away from smart policy to utilize the talents of young men and women who love America, and farther away from the values America holds dear.

Vote ''no'' on this malicious piece of legislation.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, this bill isn't just an assault on Dreamers who grew up in our communities and except on paper, are Americans in every way.

It's not just an attack on their parents who raised them and taught them their values and love of this great country.

What it is, is an affront to everyone who believes in the American Dream and our American values. It is an affront to those who uphold and subscribe to the basic notion that America is a fair, compassionate, and welcoming nation.

It is unconscionable that this bill will condemn Dreamers and their parents to second-class status.

It is unconscionable that this bill will cruelly foreclose any possibility that Dreamers and their parents could adjust their status, regardless of how hard they work or how much they contribute to their communities and our country.

If deported, their loss will be America's loss as we will lose the benefits of their talents and their ability to strengthen our economy and enrich our nation.

If we end DACA, our country could lose young people like Paola, a medical student from Los Angeles, to cure the sick. We would lose Andree, a brilliant young woman who is also from LA, who is studying at Harvard and dreams of one day curing cancer.

President Clinton once observed that ''we cannot build our own future without helping others to build theirs.''

That sentiment—the basic awareness that we're all in this together—is at the center of the American Dream, a Dream which is threatened by the bill before us.

Let's stand up for Dreamers, for their families and for our nation's future by defeating this mean-spirited and destructive legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 710, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, this 15-minute vote on the passage of the bill will be followed by a 5-minute vote on agreeing to the motion to concur in the Senate amendments to House Joint Resolution 76.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 216, noes 192, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 479]

AYES—216

Aderholt
Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Dent
DeSantis
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—192

Amodei
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano

Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Lipinski

NOT VOTING—23

Blumenauer
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Davis (CA)
DesJarlais
Fattah
Garamendi
Gibbs
Grayson
Green, Gene
Hanabusa
Kennedy
McDermott
Miller, Gary
Nunes
Nunnelee
Ruiz
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schock
Speier
Whitfield

□ 2155

Mr. PETERS of California changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote 479 (On Passage of H.R. 5272), had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.J. Res. 76) making continuing appropriations for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 395, nays 8, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 480]

YEAS—395

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—8

Amash
Ellison
Jones
Lofgren
Massie
Moran
O'Rourke
Sanford

NOT VOTING—29

Blackburn
Blumenauer
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Davis (CA)
DesJarlais
Doggett
Fattah
Garamendi
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Grayson
Green, Gene
Hanabusa
Kennedy
Marchant
McDermott
Miller, Gary
Murphy (PA)
Nunes
Nunnelee
Ruiz
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schock
Speier
Tiberi
Whitfield

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 2203

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote 480, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE ON THE CURRENT SITUATION IN IRAQ

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 683) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives on the current situation in Iraq and the urgent need to protect religious minorities from persecution from the Sunni Islamist insurgent and terrorist group the Islamic State in Iraq and Levant (ISIL) as it expands its control over areas in northwestern Iraq, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 683

Whereas Iraq is currently embroiled in a political and religious insurrection stemming from an Islamic State in Iraq and Levant (ISIL)-led offensive that began in the Anbar province and has spread to key locations such as Mosul, Tikrit, and Samarra and continues to engulf the region in violence and instability;

Whereas ISIL is a transnational Sunni insurgency whose ideological and organizational roots lie in both al Qaeda in Iraq and the Syria-based Jabhat al Nursa and has a stated mission of establishing an Islamic state and a caliphate across the Levant through violence against Shiites, non-Muslims, and unsupportive Sunnis;

Whereas Iraq's population is approximately 31,300,000 with 97 percent identifying

themselves as Muslim and the approximately 3 percent of religious minorities groups comprising of Christians, Yezidis, Sabean-Mandaeans, Bahais, Shabaks, Kakais, and Jews;

Whereas the Iraqi Christian population is estimated to be between 400,000 and 850,000 with two-thirds being Chaldean, one-fifth Assyrian, and the remainder consisting of Syriacs, Protestants, Armenians, and Anglicans;

Whereas the Iraqi constitution provides for religious freedom by stating—

(1) ''no law may be enacted that contradicts the principles of democracy'';

(2) ''no law may be enacted that contradicts the rights and basic freedoms stipulated in this Constitution''; and

(3) ''[This Constitution] guarantees the full religious rights to freedom of religious belief and practice of all individuals such as Christians, Yazidis, and Mandean Sabeans'';

Whereas over 500,000 people have been displaced by the current situation in Iraq and reports have surfaced of targeted harassment, persecution, and killings of Iraqi religious minorities by ISIL with little to no protection from the Iraqi Government and other security forces;

Whereas the fall of Mosul in particular has sparked enough anxiety among the Christian population that for the first time in 1,600 years there was no Mass in the city;

Whereas over 50 percent of Iraq's Christian population has fled since the fall of Saddam Hussein, 1,100,000 people of diverse religious backgrounds remain internally displaced and the government under Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki has not upheld its commitment to protect the rights of religious minorities;

Whereas the United States has provided over $73,000,000 of cumulative assistance to Iraq's minority populations since 2003 through economic development, humanitarian services, and capacity development;

Whereas 84,902 Iraqis have resettled to the United States between 2007 and 2013 and over 300,000 Chaldean and Assyrians currently reside throughout the country, particularly in Michigan, California, Arizona, Illinois, and Ohio; and

Whereas President Barack Obama recently declared on Religious Freedom Day, ''Foremost among the rights Americans hold sacred is the freedom to worship as we choose . . . we also remember that religious liberty is not just an American right; it is a universal human right to be protected here at home and across the globe. This freedom is an essential part of human dignity, and without it our world cannot know lasting peace'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) reaffirms its commitments to promoting and protecting religious freedom around the world and providing relief to minority groups facing persecution;

(2) calls on the United States Department of State to work with the Kurdistan Regional Government, the Iraqi central government, neighboring countries, the diaspora community in the United States, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, and other key stakeholders to help secure safe havens for those claiming amnesty in Iraq; and

(3) respectfully requests the addition of a Special Representative for Religious Minorities to be included in Prime Minister al-Maliki's newly reconstructed government.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the text at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That the House of Representatives—

(1) deplores and condemns the religious bigotry, vandalism and destruction of property, and violent attacks on and intimidation of innocent Iraqi civilians by armed extremists;

(2) calls on the United States Department of State to work with the Kurdistan Regional Government, the Iraqi central government, neighboring countries, the diaspora community in the United States, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, and other key stakeholders to help secure safe havens for those claiming amnesty in Iraq;

(3) calls on the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to work with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees on a sustained basis to document human rights abuses against Iraqi civilians and develop an immediate plan to facilitate safe humanitarian access to potable water, health care, fuel, electricity, and basic security for the most vulnerable civilian populations;

(4) calls upon the Government of Iraq to take immediate steps to protect the safety and constitutional rights of all Iraqi citizens;

(5) respectfully requests the addition of a Special Representative for Religious Minorities to be included in the newly reconstructed government of Iraq; and

(6) reaffirms its commitments to promoting and protecting religious freedom around the world and providing relief to minority groups facing persecution.

Mr. ROYCE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO THE PREAMBLE OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the preamble at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas Iraq is currently embroiled in a political and religious insurrection stemming from an Islamic State in Iraq and Levant (ISIL)-led offensive that began in the Anbar province and has spread to key locations such as Mosul, Tikrit, and Samarra and continues to engulf the region in violence and instability;

Whereas ISIL is a transnational Sunni insurgency whose ideological and organizational roots lie in both al Qaeda in Iraq and the Syria-based Jabhat al Nursa and has a stated mission of establishing an Islamic state and a caliphate across the Levant through violence against Shiites, non-Muslims, and unsupportive Sunnis;

Whereas Iraq's population is approximately 31,300,000 with 97 percent identifying themselves as Muslim and the approximately 3 percent of religious minorities groups comprising of Christians, Yezidis, Sabean-Mandaeans, Bahais, Shabaks, Kakais, and Jews;

Whereas the Iraqi Christian population is estimated to be between 400,000 and 850,000 with two-thirds being Chaldean, one-fifth Assyrian, and the remainder consisting of Syriacs, Protestants, Armenians, and Anglicans;

Whereas the Iraqi constitution provides for religious freedom by stating—

(1) ''no law may be enacted that contradicts the principles of democracy'';

(2) ''no law may be enacted that contradicts the rights and basic freedoms stipulated in this Constitution''; and

(3) ''[This Constitution] guarantees the full religious rights to freedom of religious belief and practice of all individuals such as Christians, Yazidis, and Mandean Sabeans'';

Whereas over 500,000 people have been displaced by the current situation in Iraq and reports have surfaced of targeted harassment, persecution, and killings of Iraqi religious minorities by ISIL with little to no protection from the Iraqi Government and other security forces;

Whereas the fall of Mosul in particular has sparked enough anxiety among the Christian population that for the first time in 1,600 years there was no Mass in the city;

Whereas over 50 percent of Iraq's Christian population has fled since the fall of Saddam Hussein, 1,100,000 people of diverse religious backgrounds remain internally displaced and the government under Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki has not upheld its commitment to protect the rights of religious minorities;

Whereas the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees reports as of January 2014 a total population of concern in Iraq numbering 1,522,855 people, including refugees and internally displaced persons, many of whom face grave deprivation and imminent threats to life, health, and safety;

Whereas the United States has provided over $73,000,000 of cumulative assistance to Iraq's minority populations since 2003 through economic development, humanitarian services, and capacity development;

Whereas 84,902 Iraqis have resettled to the United States between 2007 and 2013 and over 300,000 Chaldean and Assyrians currently reside throughout the country, particularly in Michigan, California, Arizona, Illinois, and Ohio; and

Whereas President Barack Obama recently declared on Religious Freedom Day, ''Foremost among the rights Americans hold sacred is the freedom to worship as we choose . . . we also remember that religious liberty is not just an American right; it is a universal human right to be protected here at home and across the globe. This freedom is an essential part of human dignity, and without it our world cannot know lasting peace'': Now, therefore, be it

Mr. ROYCE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WELCOMING AFRICAN LEADERS TO FIRST UNITED STATES-AFRICA LEADERS' SUMMIT

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Ways and Means be discharged from further consideration of the resolution

(H. Res. 699) welcoming African leaders to the first United States-Africa Leaders' Summit and African trade ministers to the 13th Forum of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA), and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 699

Whereas the United States Congress enacted the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA) in 2000, with broad bipartisan support and with a view to expanding growth and opportunity in Africa;

Whereas in the original AGOA legislation, Congress encouraged the establishment of more regular high-level dialogues, including regular meetings by the President with his African counterparts;

Whereas the people of Africa share the hopes and aspirations of the people of the United States for peace and prosperity, and are both committed to strengthening economic relations;

Whereas it is in the national interest of the United States to support the reduction of poverty in the continent of Africa;

Whereas greater opportunities for mutually beneficial trade and investments promote economic growth, development, poverty reduction, democracy, the rule of law, and stability;

Whereas good governance, including respecting constitutional term limits, human rights, and ensuring that civil society organizations are able to function freely contribute to enduring economic and social development in Africa;

Whereas the countries in Africa are important economic partners of the United States;

Whereas Africa has today 6 of the 10 fastest growing economies in the world, over 1,000,000,000 people, 60 percent of the world's uncultivated agricultural land, and expanding democracies;

Whereas Africa is rich through the youth of its population, enjoying a demographic advantage over all other regions of the world, and is likely to replace China as the biggest contributor to the global workforce by 2050;

Whereas it is in the economic interest of the United States to engage and compete in emerging African markets, boost United States-Africa trade and investment, support greater capacity building for Africa, and invest in Africa's youth and leadership development;

Whereas exports from sub-Saharan Africa to the United States under AGOA have increased over three-fold from $7,600,000,000 in 2001 to $24,800,000,000 in 2013;

Whereas United States exports to sub-Saharan Africa have increased from $6,900,000,000 to $23,900,000,000 and United States investment in sub-Saharan Africa has increased six-fold;

Whereas per capita income in sub-Saharan Africa has more than tripled to $1,624 annually since Congress first passed AGOA, yet nearly half the population in sub-Saharan Africa lives in poverty;

Whereas timely renewal of AGOA, which expires September 30, 2015, is critical to the maintenance and promotion of investment opportunities in the region;

Whereas regional integration should be strengthened to improve the full utilization of AGOA preferences, and elimination of barriers to trade and investment in Africa, such as high tariffs, forced localization requirements, restrictions on investment, and customs barriers, among others, will strengthen and improve regional and global integration;

Whereas it remains the goal of United States policy to support the diversification of sub-Saharan exports in terms of products and countries that utilize AGOA;

Whereas the members of the World Trade Organization (WTO) adopted several important Decisions and Declarations in Bali, Indonesia, in December 2013, including the Agreement on Trade Facilitation and specific results on agriculture and development, with the protocol of amendment for the Agreement on Trade Facilitation to be adopted on July 31, 2014;

Whereas full implementation of the Agreement on Trade Facilitation will help to address supply-side constraints in Africa, promote regional integration on the continent, and facilitate integration into global supply chains;

Whereas the House of Representatives introduced on June 27, 2013, and passed on May 8, 2014, the Electrify Africa Act, to make it a national policy of the United States to promote the electrification of Sub-Saharan Africa to more than double the number of people with access to power in order to improve health and education outcomes and stimulate economic opportunity; and

Whereas, on June 30, 2013, in Cape Town, South Africa, President Barack Obama announced the Power Africa Initiative, to significantly increase the number of people with access to power in Sub-Saharan Africa: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) welcomes African leaders to the first United States–Africa Leaders' Summit in Washington, DC;

(2) welcomes African trade ministers to the 13th African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA) Forum;

(3) recognizes the significant progress and hope that modern Africa represents today in global affairs and economic advancement with its booming demographics, increasing modernization, dynamic youth, and vast resources;

(4) acknowledges the vast opportunities to boost cultural, trade, and economic relations and partnerships between the United States and Africa;

(5) recognizes the importance of renewing the AGOA program well before its expiration in September 2015;

(6) supports studying potential changes to the program to improve its effectiveness and utilization and exploring how Africa can address barriers to become more attractive to trade and investment within Africa as well as globally;

(7) encourages the prompt and full implementation of the World Trade Organization (WTO) Trade Facilitation Agreement as one important way to address supply-side barriers and encourage greater trade and investment in Africa; and

(8) welcomes that the African Leaders at the African Union Summit on June 27, 2014, reaffirmed their commitments to all the decisions the Ministers took in Bali, including emphasizing that assistance and support for capacity building should be provided as envisaged in the Agreement on Trade Facilitation, and that the Agreement should be implemented in line with the decision Trade Ministers took in Bali, which provides that a protocol be adopted by July 31, 2014, and definitive entry into force by July 31, 2015.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the text at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That the House of Representatives—

(1) is studying ways to improve the effectiveness and utilization of the range of United States trade policy tools with respect to Africa, including AGOA, and exploring how Africa can address barriers to become more attractive to trade and investment within Africa as well as globally; and

(2) looks forward to continuing to work with African leaders to improve our economic and bilateral relationships.

Mr. ROYCE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO THE PREAMBLE OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the preamble at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas the people of Africa share the hopes and aspirations of the people of the United States for peace and prosperity, and are both committed to strengthening economic relations;

Whereas it is in the national interest of the United States to support the reduction of poverty in the continent of Africa;

Whereas greater opportunities for mutually beneficial trade and investments promote economic growth, development, poverty reduction, democracy, the rule of law, and stability;

Whereas the countries in Africa are important economic partners of the United States;

Whereas Africa has today 6 of the 10 fastest growing economies in the world, over 1 billion people, 60 percent of the world's uncultivated agricultural land, and expanding democracies;

Whereas Africa is rich through the youth of its population, enjoying a demographic advantage over all other regions of the world, and is likely to replace the People's Republic of China as the biggest contributor to the global workforce by 2050;

Whereas it is in the economic interest of the United States to engage and compete in emerging African markets, boost United States-Africa trade and investment, support greater capacity building for Africa, and invest in Africa's youth and leadership development;

Whereas in 2000 the Congress passed the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA), with broad bipartisan support and with a view to expanding growth and opportunity in Africa;

Whereas in the original AGOA legislation, Congress encouraged the establishment of more regular high-level dialogues, including regular meetings by the President with his African counterparts;

Whereas exports from sub-Saharan Africa to the United States under AGOA have increased over three-fold from $7.6 billion in 2001 to $24.8 billion in 2013;

Whereas United States exports to sub-Saharan Africa have increased from $6.9 billion to $23.9 billion and United States investment in sub-Saharan Africa has increased six-fold;

Whereas per capita income in sub-Saharan Africa has more than tripled to $1,624 annually since Congress first passed AGOA, yet nearly half the population in sub-Saharan Africa lives in poverty;

Whereas regional integration should be strengthened to boost economic growth in Africa, and elimination of barriers to trade and investment in Africa, such as high tariffs, forced localization requirements, restrictions on investment, and customs barriers, among others, will strengthen and improve regional and global integration;

Whereas it remains the goal of United States policy to support the diversification of sub-Saharan exports in terms of products and countries that utilize AGOA;

Whereas the members of the World Trade Organization adopted several important Decisions and Declarations in Bali, Indonesia, in December 2013, including the Agreement on Trade Facilitation and specific results on agriculture and development, with the protocol of amendment for the Agreement on Trade Facilitation to be adopted on July 31, 2014;

Whereas full implementation by our trading partners of the Agreement on Trade Facilitation will help to address supply-side constraints in Africa, promote regional integration on the continent, and facilitate integration into global supply chains;

Whereas on June 30, 2013, in Cape Town, South Africa, President Barack Obama announced the Power Africa Initiative, to double the number of people with access to power in Sub-Saharan Africa;

Whereas on May 8, 2014, the House of Representatives passed the Electrify Africa Act, to make it a national policy of the United States to support the electrification of sub-Saharan Africa, and to direct United States agencies to devote resources to facilitate and support the implementation of this initiative; and

Whereas the first United States-Africa Leaders' Summit and the 13th African Growth and Opportunity Act Forum will be held in Washington, DC, this summer: Now, therefore, be it

Mr. ROYCE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST TO DELETE REMARKS IN DEBATE

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to strike from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the words of the gentlewoman from Minnesota who described placing a handcuff on one hand of the President's——

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I object as the request is not timely.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

Excuse me. May I finish my unanimous consent request? Thank you.

She in one moment described putting one handcuff on one hand of the President's and a second handcuff on the second hand of the President's and handcuffing the lawless President of the United States.

Those are words which are not appropriate in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that they be stricken. Impugning the character and integrity of the President of the United States is a clear violation of the rules of this House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I do object. The request is not timely.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. CICILLINE. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for a moment.

There is no requirement that a unanimous consent request be timely. The House can consent unanimously to any course of action. I am asking the House to consent unanimously to striking these particular words from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. There is no requirement under the House rules that it be done contemporaneously, that is, of taking down the words of today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has stated a unanimous consent request, and there has been an objection.

Mr. CICILLINE. And I have heard no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. There is an objection to the unanimous consent request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is an objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of personal business.

Mr. FATTAH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and a Joint Resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 231. An act to reauthorize the Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp; the Committee on Overnight and Government Reform: in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

S.J. Res. 36. Joint resolution relating to the approval and implementation of the proposed agreement for nuclear cooperation between the United States and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the speaker:

H.R. 3230. An Act to improve the access of veterans to medical services from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3548. An Act to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to expand the definition of trauma to include thermal, electrical, chemical, radioactive, and other extrinsic agents.

H.R. 4360. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Forest Service for the Grandfather Ranger District located at 109 Lawing Drive in Nebo, North Carolina, as the ''Jason Crip Forest Service Building''.

H.R. 4631. An Act to reauthorize certain provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to autism, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4838. An Act to redesignate the railroad station located at 2955 Market Street in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, commonly known as ''30th Street Station'', as the ''William H. Gray III 30th Street Station''.

H.R. 5021. An act to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(b) of House Resolution 694, the House stands adjourned until 10 a.m. on Monday, August 4, 2014.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, August 4, 2014, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6775. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6776. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6777. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6778. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6779. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6780. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6781. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6782. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6783. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6784. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6785. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6786. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6787. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6788. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6789. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6790. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6791. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6792. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6793. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6794. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6795. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6796. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6797. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6798. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6799. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6800. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6801. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6802. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6803. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6804. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6805. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6806. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6807. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6808. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6809. A letter from the Deputy Director, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — Medicare Program; Inpatient Rehabilitation Facility Prospective Payment System for Federal Fiscal Year 2015 [CMS-1608-F] (RIN: 0938-AS09) received July 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

6810. A letter from the Deputy Director, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — Medicare Program; Inpatient Psychiatric Facilities Prospective Payment System — Update for Fiscal Year Beginning October 1, 2014 (FY 2015) [CMS-1606-F] (RIN: 0938-AS08) received July 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

6811. A letter from the Deputy Director, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — Medicare Program; Prospective Payment System and Consolidated Billing for Skilled Nursing Facilities for FY 2015 [CMS-1605-F] (RIN: 0938-AS07) received July 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 710. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5320) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5272) to prohibit certain actions with respect to deferred action for aliens not lawfully present in the United States, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules (Rept. 113–571). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr. LEWIS, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 5390. A bill to impose sanctions against persons who knowingly provide material support or resources to the Donbass People's Militia or its affiliates, associated groups, or agents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 5391. A bill to direct the Architect of the Capitol to place a chair on the grounds of the United States Capitol honoring American Prisoners of War/Missing in Action; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. ELLMERS (for herself, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. HUDSON):

H.R. 5392. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the determination of the employer mandate under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act without regard to alien agricultural seasonal workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 5393. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for required Medicare hospice program surveys, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia:

H.R. 5394. A bill to provide for the elimination of the Department of Education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 5395. A bill to establish a United States Boxing Commission to administer the Professional Boxing Safety Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 5396. A bill to require servicers to establish a deed-for-lease program under which eligible mortgagors may remain in their

homes as renters; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. McCLINTOCK (for himself and Mr. BISHOP of Utah):

H.R. 5397. A bill to modify the boundary of Yosemite National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PETERS of California (for himself, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 5398. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for additional qualification requirements for individuals appointed to marriage and family therapist positions in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS of California (for himself and Mr. VARGAS):

H.R. 5399. A bill to modify the grace period prior to the repayment period for certain Federal direct loans and to exclude from Federal income taxation certain employer-provided student loan assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOHO (for himself, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. MCALLISTER):

H.R. 5400. A bill to provide for State enforcement of border security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. JOYCE):

H. Res. 711. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States Postal Service should take all appropriate measures to ensure the continuation of door delivery for all business and residential customers; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. RUSH:

H. Res. 712. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should initiate negotiations to enter into a bilateral free trade agreement with the Republic of South Africa; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 5302.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, and 18), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia; and to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the foregoing powers.''

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 5390.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Sections 8, Clauses 1, 10, and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 5391.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mrs. ELLMERS:

H.R. 5392.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, Sec. 8, cl. 1.

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 5393.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia:

H.R. 5394.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (the Spending Clause) of the United States Constitution states that ''The Congress shall have the Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.'' This bill restores the proper balance of power between the federal and state governments as intended under the 10th Amendment to the Constitution by devolving the responsibilities related to education to the states and individuals.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 5395.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 5396.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. McCLINTOCK:

H.R. 5397.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (the Property Clause), which confers on Congress the power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States, and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. PETERS of California:

H.R. 5398.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PETERS of California:

H.R. 5399.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. YOHO:

H.R. 5400.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States, which grants Congress the ''Power To...provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.''

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 20: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.

H.R. 32: Mr. GRIMM and Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 292: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. HORSFORD, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 494: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Mr. GARCIA.

H.R. 533: Mr. KILMER, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 543: Mr. NOLAN and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 690: Mr. GRIMM, Mr. BARR, and Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 720: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 725: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 728: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 765: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 808: Ms. WATERS and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 861: Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 1074: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1136: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 1318: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 1339: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 1427: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 1547: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 1563: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 1601: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 1620: Mr. GRIMM.

H.R. 1666: Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 1812: Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 1827: Mr. BARR.

H.R. 1852: Mr. MAFFEI and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 1907: Mr. BERA of California.

H.R. 2027: Mr. FLEMING.

H.R. 2099: Mr. COTTON.

H.R. 2322: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2366: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 2504: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 2529: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 2536: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 2654: Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H.R. 2780: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 2825: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 2835: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 2847: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2856: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. McNerney, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 2869: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 2870: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 2902: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 2918: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 2994: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 3118: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 3199: Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 3335: Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 3367: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 3382: Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 3383: Ms. TSONGAS and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 3486: Mr. MICA and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 3560: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 3680: Mr. HONDA, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 3689: Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 3722: Ms. SINEMA and Ms. JENKINS.
H.R. 3833: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 4035: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 4060: Mr. PETERS of California and Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 4143: Mr. LEWIS.
H.R. 4145: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4158: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 4190: Mr. BARR and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 4217: Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 4219: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 4223: Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 4260: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 4306: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 4319: Mr. FLEMING, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 4336: Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 4382: Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 4385: Mr. CALVERT and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 4388: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 4432: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 4440: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 4503: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 4510: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
H.R. 4578: Mr. PETERS of Michigan.
H.R. 4582: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 4607: Mr. COSTA and Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 4623: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
H.R. 4628: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 4682: Mr. SMITH of Missouri and Mr. BARR.
H.R. 4717: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 4755: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 4793: Mr. MCCLINTOCK and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 4818: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 4885: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. CARNEY.
H.R. 4886: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 4888: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R.4906: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 4916: Mr. ROONEY and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 4920: Ms. GABBARD.
H.R. 4960: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 4964: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 4966: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
H.R. 4969: Mr. LANCE, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. JONES, and Mr. REED.
H.R. 4971: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 4978: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 4998: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 5015: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 5051: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
H.R. 5059: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 5071: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 5083: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 5110: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. HURT.
H.R. 5114: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 5138: Mr. SANFORD.
H.R. 5159: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 5180: Mr. BARR.
H.R. 5212: Mrs. ELLMERS.
H.R. 5216: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 5219: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 5226: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 5227: Mr. SMITH of Missouri and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 5233: Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 5235: Mr. MEADOWS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. TITUS, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SALMON, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 5239: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TAKANO, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 5245: Mrs. ELLMERS and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 5252: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 5263: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 5279: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 5285: Mr. BARR and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 5306: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 5310: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 5321: Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 5325: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 5328: Mr. RIGELL, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 5330: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 5338: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 5352: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 5354: Mr. COSTA, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 5363: Ms. NORTON, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 5372: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 5382: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 5384: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. RIGELL.
H.J. Res. 68: Mr. LEWIS.
H.J. Res. 118: Mr. ROTHFUS.
H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. CLEAVER.
H. Res. 72: Mr. PETERS of California.
H. Res. 440: Ms. PELOSI.
H. Res. 520: Mr. CALVERT.
H. Res. 536: Mr. DAINES.
H. Res. 665: Mr. POMPEO.
H. Res. 668: Mr. GERLACH and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H. Res. 683: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. YODER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. WOLF, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BOUSTANY, Ms. CHU, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DENT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GOSAR, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LATTA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MEADOWS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PITTS, Mr. POLIS, Mr. POSEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCALISE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. KING of Iowa.
H. Res. 688: Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. TERRY.
H. Res. 689: Ms. WATERS.
H. Res. 698: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H. Res. 699: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. SCHOCK.
H. Res. 701: Ms. WATERS, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ENYART, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. BEATTY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. VELA, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. KILMER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. POCAN, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. WELCH, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. HAHN, Ms. MENG, and Mr. GARCIA.
H. Res. 707: Ms. GRANGER and Mr. BILIRAKIS.